DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 661 SO 030 637

AUTHOR	Tolo, Kenneth W.
TITLE	An Assessment of "We the People...Project Citizen": Promoting Citizenship in Classrooms and Communities. A Report by the Policy Research Project on "An Assessment of Project Citizen." Policy Research Project Report Number 129.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin. Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.
ISBN	ISBN-0-89940-742-0
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	318p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, P.O. Box Y, Austin, Texas 78713-8925; Tel: 512-471-4218.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship; *Citizenship Education; *Democracy; Formative Evaluation; Law Related Education; Middle Schools; Program Evaluation; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Implementation Analysis; *We the People Project Citizen

ABSTRACT

Civic education seeks to engage students in their communities by teaching them the necessary skills to effectively participate in society. The middle school years are a crucial time for the development of civic roles and responsibilities. The report documents "We the People...Project Citizen," a national civic education program for middle school students developed by the Center for Civic Education (CCE) in collaboration with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). It states that "Project Citizen" implementation began during the 1995-96 school year, and that in just 3 years, it has blossomed into a national program with state coordinators in 45 states. The report provides background information about civic education and "Project Citizen" and sets the national context. Seven key areas of "Project Citizen" implementation are examined and recommendations are offered for getting the maximum out of implementation efforts in each of these areas. Overarching and long-term recommendations for building a strong framework to solidify and expand the use of "Project Citizen" nationally are presented. Includes extensive tables of data. Appendixes contain "Project Citizen" state summaries, a state coordinator contact list, an evaluation plan, a state coordinator survey (November 1997), a state coordinator survey, a teacher survey (January 1998), a student survey (January 1998), and sample "Project Citizen" letters. (BT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AN ASSESSMENT OF

CITIZEN

ED 431 661

SO 030 637

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Duncan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PROMOTING CITIZENSHIP IN CLASSROOMS AND COMMUNITIES

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Policy Research Project Report

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

129

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
Policy Research Project Report
Number 129

An Assessment of *We the People… Project Citizen*: Promoting Citizenship in Classrooms and Communities

Project directed by
Kenneth W. Tolo

A report by the
Policy Research Project on
An Assessment of Project Citizen
1998

Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 98-67458
ISBN: 0-89940-742-0

©1998 by the Board of Regents
The University of Texas

Printed in the U.S.A.
All rights reserved

4

Policy Research Project Participants

Students

Brandon Atkinson, B.A. (History), Rutgers University

Lisa Cash Driskill, B.A. (Economics, Political Science), Texas A & M University

Rachel Feit, B.A. (Political Science, English), University of Miami

Maria D. Gutierrez, B.A. (Political Science), University of California, San Diego

Sarah Lowthian, B.A. (Political Science), Tufts University

Jody L. McCoy, B.A. (Political Science), University of California, Berkeley

Beth McNeill, B.A. (History), University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; J.D., Wake Forest University

Suzie Meltz, B.A. (Social Science), New College at the University of South Florida

Writer Mott, B.A. (Political Science), Colorado College

Anne Ray, B.A. (Economics, History), Wellesley College

Vivita L. Rozenbergs, B.A. (International Relations), University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Paul Shelton, B.A. (Political Science), East Stroudsburg University

Brandi Stewart, B.A. (Business), University of Oregon

Pete Weber, B.A. (English, History), University of Iowa

Sarah J. Wheat, B.A. (English), Kenyon College

Project Director

Kenneth W. Tolo, Ph.D., Professor of Public Affairs, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs

Contents

List of Tables ix

Foreword xi

Acknowledgments xiii

Executive Summary xv

- Key Findings xv
- Future of Project Citizen xix

Chapter 1. Introduction 1

- History of Project Citizen 1
- Project Citizen Activity as of Spring 1998 2
- Center for Civic Education: Mission and History 5
- Project Citizen Evaluation Plan 7
- Overview of Report 10

Chapter 2. Civic Education and Middle Schools 13

- Tradition of Civic Education 13
- Goals and Qualities of Civic Education 13
- Rationale for Civic Education 14
- Critical Middle School Years 16
- Project Citizen 17

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Worldwide Web Research Puts California Classroom on the Map 21

Chapter 3. State Administration 23

- Responsibilities and Duties 23
- Profile of State Coordinators 24
- Administrative Support for the State Coordinator 25
- Working Relationship with CCE 26
- Training State Coordinators 27
- Lessons Learned 28
- Recommendations 30

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Colorado Students Take to the Streets to Help Homeless Teens 34

Chapter 4. Recruiting and Building Support Among Teachers and Administrators 35

Factors Influencing State Coordinators' Success in Recruitment and Outreach .. 35
Recruitment Approaches: Deciding Whom to Target 37
Recruitment Approaches: Deciding How to Describe Project Citizen 44
Outreach Strategies 47
Recommendations 49

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Alabama Students Succeed—New Traffic Light Installed! 57

Chapter 5. Teacher Training 59

Number of Teachers Trained 59
Types of Teacher Training 60
Training Methods in Selected States 61
Key Elements in Teacher Training 64
Barriers to Effective Teacher Training 64
Recommendations 68

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Each One Teaches One at Indiana Middle School 74

Chapter 6. Teacher and Class Use 75

Classes in which Project Citizen is Used 75
Challenges and Opportunities 79
Recommendations 86

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Arizona Classroom Tackles AIDS Prevention in Tempe 92

Chapter 7. Competitions 93

Types and Levels of Competitions 93
Student Recognition and Feedback 95
Barriers to Participating in a Competition 96
Intended Outcomes 98
Recommendations 99

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Students Push for Paychecks for Fire Department in Alabama 105

Chapter 8. Benefits to Students 107

Key Findings 107

Recommendations 117

Project Citizen Student Success Story: Slower Cars Make the Streets Safer for Students in Ohio 126

Chapter 9. Financial and Political Support 127

Roles and Responsibilities 127

Strategies to Build Program Support 130

Sources of Program Funding 132

Obstacles to Program Support 137

Recommendations 139

Project Citizen Student Success Story: North Carolina Class Calls for Clean-Up of Currituck Sound 145

Chapter 10. Framework for Implementation 147

Early Successes 147

Foundation for the Future 149

Conclusion 154

Appendix A. Project Citizen State Summaries: Spring 1998 159

Appendix B. Project Citizen State Coordinator Contact List 249

Appendix C. *We the People... Project Citizen* Evaluation Plan 255

Appendix D. Project Citizen State Coordinator Survey: November 1997 261

Appendix E. Project Citizen State Coordinator Survey: December 1997 267

Appendix F. Project Citizen Teacher Survey: January 1998 277

Appendix G. Project Citizen Student Survey: January 1998 289

Appendix H. Sample Project Citizen Letters 293

List of Tables

Table 1.1 State Summary of Project Citizen Activity: Spring 1998 3

Table 1.2 Center for Civic Education Programs and Publications 6

Table 1.3 Project Citizen Evaluation Plan: Research Questions and Methodologies 9

Table 3.1 Average Hours Per Week State Coordinator Spends on Project Citizen 24

Table 3.2 Administrative Support for Project Citizen State Coordinator 25

Table 3.3 Responsiveness of CCE in Meeting Project Citizen State Coordinators' Program Needs 26

Table 4.1 Types of Teachers Targeted by Project Citizen State Coordinators 44

Table 4.2 State Coordinator Outreach Strategies to Teachers 48

Table 4.3 How Teachers First Learn About Project Citizen 48

Table 6.1 Teachers' Perspectives on How Well Project Citizen Helps Students Achieve Education Goals 76

Table 6.2 Subject Matter of Project Citizen Classes 77

Table 6.3 Grade Levels of Project Citizen Classes 78

Table 6.4 Academic Ability Levels of Project Citizen Classes 79

Table 6.5 Challenges Perceived by Teachers to Using Project Citizen 80

Table 6.6 Parental Involvement With Project Citizen 85

Table 6.7 Project Citizen Portfolio Topics 85

Table 7.1 Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Project Citizen Program Elements on Student Learning 98

Table 10.1 Project Citizen Roles and Responsibilities 155

Foreword

The Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs has established interdisciplinary research on policy problems as the core of its educational program. A major part of this program is the nine-month policy research project, in the course of which two or more faculty members from different disciplines direct the research of ten to thirty graduate students of diverse backgrounds on a policy issue of concern to a government or nonprofit agency. This "client orientation" brings the students face to face with administrators, legislators, and other officials active in the policy process and demonstrates that research in a policy environment demands special talents. It also illuminates the occasional difficulties of relating research findings to the world of political realities.

This assessment of *We the People... Project Citizen* stems from a policy research project commissioned by the Center for Civic Education in 1997-98. Recommendations highlight ways in which Project Citizen implementation can be more fully developed, utilized, and expanded across the country.

The curriculum of the LBJ School is intended not only to develop effective public servants but also to produce research that will enlighten and inform those already engaged in the policy process. The project that resulted in this report has helped to accomplish the first task; it is our hope that the report itself will contribute to the second.

Finally, it should be noted that neither the LBJ School nor The University of Texas at Austin necessarily endorses the views or findings of this report.

Edwin Dorn
Dean

Acknowledgments

Project members acknowledge with appreciation the advice, counsel, and guidance of Center for Civic Education (CCE) officials; Project Citizen state coordinators and regional coordinators; Project Citizen teachers and students; state legislators; and other resource persons.

Thanks is especially due Charles Quigley, Michael Fischer, Greg Brozeit, Elaine Craig Segal, and Kari Coppinger at CCE, as well as the Project Citizen state coordinators in states visited by project members: Wade Black (Alabama), Libby Cupp (Ohio), Roy Erickson (California), Lynn Nelson (Indiana), Annette Boyd Pitts (Florida), Lynda Rando (Arizona), Pamela Riley (North Carolina), Roger Wangen (Minnesota), and Lon Weber (Pennsylvania). In addition, Vicki Baldwin, Austin Independent School District, and Catherine Clark, Texas Center for Educational Research, provided important guidance and assistance during the project. The knowledge and insights of these individuals helped inform the efforts of this study, although project members remain responsible for errors of interpretation or omission.

Executive Summary

Civic education, in its ideal form, seeks to engage students in their communities by teaching them the skills necessary to effectively participate in civil society. In a constitutional democracy, the importance of civic education cannot be overstated. Effective citizenship education that teaches adolescents how to participate and effect positive change within their communities is critical to the development of a lasting commitment to civic participation.

The middle school years are an especially crucial time to the development of civic roles and responsibilities. During these years, students are discovering their identities and their larger roles in their communities and in society as a whole. However, little attention has been aimed at promoting citizenship during these formative middle school years.

Recognizing the importance of civic education, especially in middle school, the Center for Civic Education (CCE), in collaboration with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), developed *We the People... Project Citizen*, a national civic education program for middle school students. Project Citizen implementation in its present form began in the 1995-96 school year. In just three years, Project Citizen has blossomed into a national program with state coordinators in 45 states. An estimated 460 teachers have used or are using the Project Citizen text in over 1,000 classes with 28,000 students. All of this has been accomplished with minimal administrative and financial support, through the diligent work of CCE and a volunteer network of Project Citizen state coordinators and other program supporters.

Implementation and growth of Project Citizen varies dramatically across states, however, and several state coordinators report various obstacles to implementation. Few states have more than ten classes using the program each year. CCE recognized the need to gain a greater knowledge of implementation across the country as well as to identify the best practices for increasing the use of Project Citizen.

This desire for a better understanding of the programmatic development served as the starting point for this assessment of Project Citizen implementation. The first two chapters of this report provide the background for civic education and Project Citizen and set the national context. Chapters 3 through 9 examine in detail seven key areas of Project Citizen implementation and offer recommendations for maximizing implementation efforts in each of these areas. The final chapter then provides some overarching and long-term recommendations for building a strong framework to solidify and expand the use of Project Citizen nationally.

Key Findings

Following are key Project Citizen implementation findings and insights from our research. Chapters 3 through 9 provide programmatic recommendations addressing these findings.

State Administration

The greatest commonality throughout the volunteer network of Project Citizen state coordinators is their commitment to instilling in middle school students an understanding of community involvement and civic participation. Yet, given coordinators' limited program resources, time, experience levels, and availability, the extent to which coordinators are able to fulfill the diverse roles and responsibilities CCE expects of them varies considerably across the nation. For example, coordinators affiliated with one or more education networks or holding full-time positions generally have access to greater logistical help and administrative support than do other coordinators.

Coordinators rate CCE very highly for its responsiveness in providing Project Citizen materials; in other areas of program need, they rate CCE from "adequate" to "good." There is wide agreement that the program needs more funding, yet few coordinators have fund-raising experience, and there is no consensus among coordinators about whose responsibility it is to raise funds. Coordinators also have diverse views about the future form of Project Citizen and the design and implementation of teacher training sessions.

Recruiting and Building Support Among Teachers and Administrators

Project Citizen is expanding in several states because of Project Citizen state coordinators' innovative and dedicated recruitment of and outreach to teachers and school administrators. Four critical factors influence coordinators' success in these areas: time availability, organizational assistance, funding, and experience. Coordinators' approaches to decide which teachers and administrators to target relative to potential Project Citizen participation vary. These approaches are bottom-up or top-down (or a combination), depending on whether the focus on teachers is direct or indirect; they are statewide or region-specific (or a combination), depending on whether they build on local relationships to create a regional critical mass or encourage teacher and school participation in all parts of a state; and they vary in terms of the subject areas of the teachers targeted.

In describing Project Citizen to targeted teachers, effective coordinators use the same program characterizations reported by Project Citizen teachers, namely, that Project Citizen fosters knowledge of government, excites students, is easy to follow, gets students involved, has concrete results and is project driven, involves everyone, develops higher-order thinking skills, integrates disciplines and skills, and fosters teamwork. The representation of Project Citizen links to state or district standards and curriculum frameworks, the opportunity to use Project Citizen alone or as a supplement to existing curricula, and the value of state competition and simulated hearings also are important recruitment approaches. Effective general outreach to (as contrasted with targeted recruitment of) teachers is often the result of the distribution of free materials, the use of diverse communication techniques, the use of incentives, and the development of strong relationships with principals, curriculum directors, and teachers.

Teacher Training

Several Project Citizen state coordinators, despite their scarce resources and, in some instances, their own lack of training experience, have taken significant steps to ensure that teachers are trained to use Project Citizen. Since the 1995-96 school year, more than 1,400 teachers in 38 states have been trained. Training approaches vary widely, however; some are short (e.g., one hour) information sessions, while others provide comprehensive and substantive (e.g., three to six hours, or more) "how to" training sessions. With respect to both kinds, teacher follow-up is critical to an effective Project Citizen teacher network.

Training approaches include conference presentations, simulated Project Citizen activities, use of Project Citizen teachers as teacher trainers, and nontraditional classroom and conference methods (e.g., student-led discussions). Teachers are best served by training sessions that include a step-by-step review of the Project Citizen curriculum, the use of visual examples to demonstrate previous portfolio projects, an exposure to alternative methods of integrating Project Citizen into classrooms and curricula, and, where appropriate, hands-on opportunities. Barriers inhibiting effective training sessions include insufficient training for state coordinators, insufficient financial resources, untimely training sessions, insufficient technical assistance, unavailable lesson plans, and inadequate teacher foundations in civic education.

Teacher and Class Use

Project Citizen is sufficiently flexible to fit into many classroom situations. It can be used in classes covering diverse subject matter, in classes of various academic ability (e.g., gifted and talented, mixed ability, remedial, and special education), and in different grade levels (primarily sixth through eighth grades, but also as young as fifth grade and as old as twelfth grade).

Seven key challenges that Project Citizen teachers face are (1) how much time to dedicate to Project Citizen; (2) how to fit the program into state and local curricula and standards; (3) how to use Project Citizen materials; (4) how to implement the program in the classroom; (5) how to determine what financial support and resources are needed to complete Project Citizen; (6) how to involve parents in the program; and (7) how to choose the Project Citizen portfolio topic. These diverse challenges illustrate the extent to which teachers are largely on their own in determining exactly how Project Citizen is implemented in the classroom and the community.

Competitions

Project Citizen competitions at the local, regional, state, and national levels provide participating students an important learning experience, reward and recognize their achievements, promote greater visibility of and financial and political support for the program, and provide incentives to potential students and teachers for future use. Thus it is critical that competitions remain a central focus of Project Citizen for teachers and students. However, CCE and state coordinator recognition of and feedback to students participating in Project Citizen competitions, especially the national competition, has been inadequate.

In addition, many states face significant barriers that impede or prevent their students from actively participating in Project Citizen competitions, especially those at the state level. Most classes are unable to travel to the site of a state competition due to financial considerations, liability issues, or a lack of time; innovative approaches to overcoming this obstacle include having judges travel to the schools, having students present and defend their portfolios via live videoconference, and obtaining special grants for competition travel. Other barriers to increased competition participation include the scheduling requirements of state and district standardized tests and the associated preparation time, as well as the dislike of some teachers for the competitive aspects of Project Citizen; for example, by a considerable margin, teachers view competitions as having the lowest impact of Project Citizen elements on student learning.

Benefits to Students

Students and teachers like using Project Citizen and believe it helps students learn valuable skills and information. Indeed, 97 percent of the Project Citizen teachers surveyed state the program is a good way to teach civic education.

Nine key findings are that (1) students using Project Citizen believe they can make a difference in their communities; (2) students *do* make a difference in their communities through Project Citizen; (3) students and teachers believe Project Citizen helps students develop a greater understanding of public policy; (4) students and teachers believe Project Citizen helps students learn how their government works and develops student commitment to active citizenship and governance; (5) students and teachers believe Project Citizen involves students in their communities and helps students learn about specific community problems; (6) students and teachers believe Project Citizen encourages students to work in groups; (7) students and teachers believe Project Citizen teaches students important communication skills; (8) students and teachers believe Project Citizen teaches students important research skills; and, equally important, (9) students enjoy Project Citizen.

Financial and Political Support

Project Citizen lacks the strong, sustainable, and broad-based financial and political support it needs, especially within the states. Generating this support is primarily the responsibility of state coordinators; however, this is an extremely challenging task, given their need to raise supplemental funds, lobby the state legislature, organize and conduct teacher training sessions, recruit teachers, and set up competitions, all while essentially serving as volunteers. The respective roles and responsibilities of state coordinators, CCE, NCSL, Project Citizen Advisory Committees, and teachers are not always understood or appreciated among Project Citizen participants.

CCE's focus on increasing federal support for Project Citizen is to help state coordinators reach the critical mass of state program activity necessary to demonstrate program success and effectiveness. Coordinators often are left to their own initiative and creativity in generating long-term support; this is being done now through direct or indirect state appropriations from state legislatures, the leadership of Project Citizen Advisory Committees, the demonstration of Project Citizen linkages to state curriculum standards, private industry or foundation grants, and in-kind support. But they continue to face substantial obstacles, including lack of legislative support for funding stand-alone programs like Project Citizen, gubernatorial line-item vetoes, competition from other civic education programs, the limited experience level of some state coordinators, and the relative newness of Project Citizen.

Future of Project Citizen

The next five to ten years are critical to expanding and solidifying Project Citizen implementation nationwide. To date, CCE and its volunteer network of state coordinators have done a strong job of sustaining and expanding the program given limited resources. However, the Project Citizen network has outgrown its current program infrastructure, and changes in administration and implementation must occur for the program to become nationally recognized.

CCE's challenge over the next five years is to find ways of maximizing the efforts of its coordinators to ensure that Project Citizen matures from the pilot stage into full implementation in all 50 states and abroad. A daunting, but realistic, vision would see Project Citizen being used in most, if not all, congressional districts. Competitions would be held in all states, culminating in a national competition that featured simulated hearings. Strong bases of financial and political support for the program would exist both nationally and within states. A longer-term vision would feature Project Citizen as one of the cornerstones in a CCE national campaign to promote civic literacy and civic participation through the establishment of state and local requirements for K-12 education in civics and government.

To achieve this vision for Project Citizen, CCE must take the lead, working with NCSL, state coordinators, educators, state legislators, community and business leaders, and foundations, to develop an implementation framework that supports future programmatic activities more strategically, actively, and collaboratively. Such a framework would include, but not be limited to, the creation of a strategic plan and planning process; the specification of clear roles and responsibilities; the establishment of ongoing training opportunities for state coordinators; the creation and enhancement of communication networks at all levels of the Project Citizen network; the publicizing of Project Citizen success stories; and the support of research studying the impact of the program on student attitudes toward government and the political process.

The recommendations contained within this report are mutually reinforcing and must be taken collectively. The implementation of only a few of them will likely not have any lasting or significant effect on the growth and success of Project Citizen. The challenge facing CCE and its Project Citizen collaborators is to refine these recommendations in view of middle school civic education challenges and opportunities and to make a sustained and collective commitment to their implementation.

Chapter 1. Introduction

We the People... Project Citizen (Project Citizen) is a middle school civic education program that was originally developed by the Center for Civic Education in 1992 under the name American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project. Implementation of the program in its present form as Project Citizen began during the 1995-96 school year. Since then, Project Citizen has been used by an estimated 450 teachers in classrooms in 38 states.

With the goal of expanding Project Citizen into all 50 states, the Center for Civic Education (CCE) invited the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin to conduct a formative evaluation of the Project Citizen program during the 1997-98 school year. The evaluation has focused on identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the program's present implementation strategies and developing recommendations to help CCE and its national volunteer network expand Project Citizen throughout the United States.

This chapter summarizes the history of Project Citizen, presents a snapshot of the program's implementation to date, and describes CCE and its goals in using Project Citizen as a means for providing civic education to middle school students. In addition, it outlines the research questions on which this evaluation is based and describes the methodologies used to answer these questions. Finally, it provides a brief overview of the entire report.

History of Project Citizen

Project Citizen evolved from a California civic education program known as the American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project (AYCPP). Developed by CCE in 1992 and sponsored by the Walt Disney Company, this program recruited middle school classes in schools from each of California's congressional districts to prepare portfolios identifying, describing, and proposing solutions to public policy issues in their communities. The process of creating a portfolio was designed to engage students in developing public policy solutions and to teach students how to become involved in solving community problems. Three hundred teachers, with 558 classes, participated in the program during this pilot year, studying issues such as drug abuse, graffiti, and pollution.[1]

Local and state competitions in California served as the culminating events for the 1992-93 AYCPP program. Each of the state's congressional districts held a competition at which volunteer judges evaluated the students' portfolios. The winning classes moved on to one of ten regional competitions within the state. Regional winners, their teachers, and up to eight parent volunteers per regional winner were invited to the statewide competition, which was held at Disney Hotel in Anaheim in June 1993. Winning classes at all competition levels were awarded cash prizes.[2]

With the hope of creating a national civic education program for middle school students, CCE, with the continued financial sponsorship of the Walt Disney Company, expanded AYCPP throughout the country in a national field test in 1993-94. During this test, 673 teachers used the program in 1,103 classes.[3] There was not a national competition during 1993-94, but Pennsylvania held a state culminating activity, and Indiana had some districts where there were local activities.[4] At the end of the 1993-94 academic year, the Walt Disney Company discontinued its sponsorship of the program, citing changes in company objectives. Unable to secure alternative organizational and financial support, CCE postponed further implementation of the program.

Rebirth of Project Citizen

In 1995, the AYCPP program concept was resurrected by CCE in partnership with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), a national organization with a strong interest in civic and legislative education. AYCPP was renamed *We the People... Project Citizen* to build on the success of CCE's *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* civic education curriculum that has been widely used by teachers across the nation for more than a decade.

Similar to the original AYCPP, Project Citizen is a civic education program for middle school students that promotes competent and responsible participation in state and local government. It seeks to actively engage students in learning how to monitor and influence public policy and to encourage civic participation among students, their parents, and members of the community. The goal of Project Citizen is to develop students' commitment to active citizenship and governance by

1. providing the knowledge and skills for effective participation,
2. providing practical experience designed to foster a sense of competence and efficacy, and
3. developing an understanding of the importance of citizen participation.[5]

As a class, students work together to identify and study a public policy issue and develop an action plan for implementing their policy. The final product is a portfolio displaying each group's work. Ideally, the class presents its portfolio in a simulated legislative hearing, demonstrating its knowledge and understanding of how public policy is formulated. Classes may also be able to enter their portfolios in a local competition with classes from other schools. Local winners submit their portfolios for a statewide competition, and state winners are evaluated in the Project Citizen national finals.[6]

Project Citizen Activity as of Spring 1998

Today, Project Citizen is administered through a volunteer network of state coordinators. State coordinators are selected by CCE and are responsible for all Project Citizen program activities, including marketing, teacher recruitment and training, tracking and reporting class activity, state and local fund-raising, and competition planning. Specific program implementation activities are described in detail in chapters 3 through 9 of this report.

Since its rebirth in the 1995-96 academic year, it is estimated that 450 teachers in 38 states used Project Citizen in 1,072 classes with nearly 28,000 students.[7] The majority of the students were in the seventh and eighth grades, although teachers report using Project Citizen with students as young as fifth grade and as old as twelfth grade. State competitions have been held at least once in 28 states. Table 1.1 shows this information in further detail.

Table 1.1
State Summary of Project Citizen Activity: Spring 1998

State	Year First Used	Est. # of Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. # of Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 97-98 State Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
Alabama	96-97	35	15	May 1998	No	No	No	No
Alaska	96-97	3	2	None	No	No	No	No
Arizona	95-96	20	12	December 1997	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Arkansas*	unable to obtain information							
California	93-94	120	60	May 1998	No	No	No	Yes
Colorado	95-96	57	7	May 1998	Yes	No	Yes	No
Connecticut	96-97	8	19	None	No	No	No	No
Delaware	----	0	0	None	No	No	No	No
Florida	95-96	49	26	May 1998	No	No	No	No
Georgia	97-98	10	0	None	No	No	No	No
Hawaii	97-98	12	2	May 1998	No	No	No	No
Idaho	96-97	7	17	May 1998	No	No	No	No
Illinois	unable to obtain information							
Indiana	94-95	0	4	May 1998	Yes	No	No	No
Iowa	96-97	30	20	March 1998	Yes	No	No	No
Kansas	97-98	70	4	June 1998	No	No	No	No
Kentucky	97-98	45	15	May 1998	No	No	Yes	No
Louisiana	97-98	10	10	June 1998	No	No	No	No
Maine	94-95	12	5	None	No	No	No	No
Maryland	96-97	20	11	March 1998	No	No	No	No

State	Year First Used	Est. # of Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. # of Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 97-98 State Compe-tition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
Massachusetts	97-98	unable to obtain info.		None	No	No	No	No
Michigan	unable to obtain information							
Minnesota	96-97	110	13	May 1998	No	Yes	Yes	No
Mississippi	97-98	0	4	May 1998	No	No	Yes	No
Missouri*	unable to obtain information							
Montana	96-97	10	11	Spring 1998	No	No	No	No
Nebraska	96-97	24	8	Spring 1998	No	Yes	Yes	No
Nevada	96-97	25	12	May 1998	Yes	Yes	No	No
New Hampshire*	unable to obtain information							
New Jersey	unable to obtain information							
New Mexico	95-96	120	21	May 1998	No	No	No	No
New York	96-97	87	1	Spring 1998	No	No	Yes	No
North Carolina	96-97	215	18	February 1998	No	No	Yes	No
North Dakota*	unable to obtain information							
Ohio	96-97	46	31	June 1998	No	No	Yes	No
Oklahoma	97-98	5	5	None	No	No	Yes	No
Oregon	97-98	0	1	None	No	No	No	No
Pennsylvania	96-97	12	28	May 1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Rhode Island	96-97	12	9	Spring 1998	No	No	No	No
South Carolina	unable to obtain information							
South Dakota	96-97	19	7	None	No	No	No	No
Tennessee	97-98	10	10	None	No	No	No	No

State	Year First Used	Est. # of Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. # of Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 97-98 State Compe-tition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
Texas	97-98	15	2	May 1998	No	No	Yes	No
Utah	unable to obtain information							
Vermont	96-97	0	9	None	No	No	No	No
Virginia	95-96	68	17	May 1998	No	No	No	No
Washington	96-97	20	6	June 1998	No	No	Yes	No
West Virginia*	unable to obtain information							
Wisconsin	96-97	25	9	June 1998	Yes	No	No	No
Wyoming	96-97	6	2	None	No	No	No	No
TOTALS	**38 States**	**1337**	**453**	—	**8 Yes**	**4 Yes**	**13 Yes**	**2 Yes**

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, November 1997; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997; and individual interviews by project members with Project Citizen state coordinators, October 1997-May 1998.

* No state coordinator currently assigned by Center for Civic Education in this state.

Center for Civic Education: Mission and History

The Center for Civic Education (CCE) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan educational organization based in California and supported by a network of program coordinators in every state in the country. CCE specializes in civic and citizenship education, law-related education, and international educational exchange programs for developing democracies. Programs focus on the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights; American political traditions and federal, state, and local institutions; constitutionalism; civic participation; and the rights and responsibilities of citizens.[8]

CCE was born from an initiative called the Committee on Civic Education, which was formed at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1964 during a time an activist U.S. Supreme Court was extending the reach of the Bill of Rights. Recognizing an absence of understanding by students and teachers of the importance of the court's actions, faculty members from the departments of political science and philosophy, law, and education came together to develop a civic education curriculum that extended beyond California's traditional history curriculum. A key goal of the Committee on Civic Education was to help teachers and students better understand their government and prepare students to be citizens.[9]

The Committee on Civic Education worked to develop civic education curricular programs for kindergarten through 12th grade students. In 1969, the State Bar of California asked the Committee on Civic Education to develop a statewide civic education program. Called the Law in a Free Society project, it was funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and focused on the major concepts and principles of constitutional democracy—authority, privacy, responsibility, and justice. In 1981, the Committee on Civic Education created a nonprofit organization called the Center for Civic Education (CCE).[10]

CCE's mission is "to promote informed, responsible participation in civic life by citizens committed to values and principles fundamental to American constitutional democracy." The principal goals of CCE's programs are to help students develop

1. an increased understanding of the institutions of American constitutional democracy and the fundamental principles and values upon which they are founded;
2. the skills necessary to participate as effective and responsible citizens; and
3. the willingness to use democratic procedures for making decisions and managing conflict.[11]

CCE has created 11 civic education programs that it administers from its headquarters in Calabasas, California, with support from state-based program coordinators, most of whom are volunteers. The programs and their primary goals are described in table 1.2.

Table 1.2
Center for Civic Education Programs and Publications

Programs and Publications	**Description and Goals**
We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution	an instructional program on the history and principles of American constitutional democracy for elementary, middle, and high school students
We the People... Project Citizen	a civic education program designed to foster the development of middle school students' interest and ability to participate competently and responsibly in their state and local governments
Law in a Free Society Series (Foundations of Democracy)	curricular materials for grades K-12 on basic concepts and principles of constitutional democracy—authority, privacy, responsibility, and justice
Exercises in Participation	a series designed to develop participatory skills for upper elementary and middle school grades

Programs and Publications	Description and Goals
Youth for Justice	a national network of programs designed to promote civic competence and responsibility at all grades and levels
CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education	a model curriculum framework for the nation's elementary and secondary schools
National Standards for Civics and Government	standards for grades k-12 that identify what students should know and be able to do in the field of civics and government when they complete grades 4, 8, and 12
Teacher Training and Summer Institutes	in-service training and summer institutes for elementary, secondary, and college teachers, and curricular supervisors throughout the nation
The American Teacher Awards	a national program sponsored by the Walt Disney Company and McDonald's (with other educational organizations), designed to honor teachers and inform the public about the contributions of the teaching profession
The Civitas International Civic Education Exchange Program	a cooperative project of a consortium of leading organizations in civic education in the United States and other participating nations
International Civic Education Exchange Program	conferences, exchanges of instructional materials, and other curricular assistance involving civic educators, scholars, and officials from the United States and other countries

Source: Center for Civic Education, "History, Mission and Programs of the Center for Civic Education" (Calabasas, Calif., September 1996).

Although CCE's programs reach youth of all ages, Project Citizen is targeted specifically to middle school students (grades six through nine). Research shows that early adolescence is a critical time for the formation of attitudes toward government and politics. It is also a time at which students are intellectually curious and eager to extend their knowledge and experience to the broader community.[12] Given these findings and CCE's goals of increasing students' understanding of and participation in civic life, middle school students are likely to enjoy and benefit from a hands-on, interactive program such as Project Citizen.

Project Citizen Evaluation Plan

This report is the result of a formative assessment that evaluates how Project Citizen is administered and how it is being implemented in states across the nation. The goal of this evaluation is to gather information on the current level of implementation and provide recommendations about how Project Citizen administration and implementation can be improved. This evaluation does not attempt to assess Project Citizen's impact on academic achievement or student attitudes. However, important information about students' Project Citizen work is included throughout the report, and program benefits to students (as perceived by teachers and students) are described in detail in chapter 8.

Invited by CCE, the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Austin (LBJ School) conducted this evaluation of Project Citizen between September 1997 and May 1998. The LBJ School's research team, led by Professor Kenneth Tolo, consisted of 15 graduate students with substantial professional experience in public, private, and nonprofit organizations.

Purpose

The Project Citizen evaluation was designed to identify conditions and practices that promote the adoption, implementation, and expansion of Project Citizen throughout the country. Specifically, the evaluation

1. assessed the extent Project Citizen is being used by students nationwide;
2. identified factors that have promoted adoption and implementation of the program;
3. identified opportunities for and barriers to implementing and expanding the program;
4. documented teacher and student perceptions of the effects of Project Citizen; and
5. presented recommendations for improving Project Citizen's effectiveness.

Research Questions, Methodologies, and Data Sources

Researchers gathered information from all 45 states having a CCE-designated Project Citizen state coordinator. Researchers collected these data primarily through written surveys and telephone interviews. In addition, to better analyze the conditions and practices that have led to successful implementation in several key states, researchers traveled to nine states to meet with state coordinators, teachers, students, civic leaders, state legislators, and others. During these visits, researchers observed simulated hearings at a state competition, teacher training sessions, and class demonstrations; administered on-site surveys; and facilitated student focus groups. The states visited were Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Indiana, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

These states were selected for site visits based on discussions with CCE staff and a variety of criteria, including number of classes in the state currently participating in the Project Citizen program, number of classes producing portfolios, conduct of a statewide competition, commitment of the state coordinator to program implementation and expansion, efforts to solicit private or public financial support for the program, conduct of teacher training sessions, and extent of participation by community leaders.

Table 1.3 outlines the evaluation's primary research questions and the methodologies used to gather information.

Table 1.3
Project Citizen Evaluation Plan: Research Questions and Methodologies

Research Question 1: To what extent is Project Citizen used nationwide? How many schools, classes, and students are participating in Project Citizen? What are the demographic characteristics of participating schools and classes?

Methodology: Information on school demographics (e.g., public or private, grade configuration, ethnic composition), class demographics (e.g., grade level, class size, subject area of instruction, academic ability level, ethnic composition), and Project Citizen participation (e.g., numbers of students, classes, teachers, and schools participating in 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98) was gathered from all states having a Project Citizen state coordinator. Researchers gathered this information from state coordinators through telephone interviews and written surveys. Additional information was obtained from participating schools and teachers identified by state coordinators and CCE.

Research Question 2:

a) What are the elements of the Project Citizen organizational structure that lead to successful implementation of the program? What barriers do state coordinators encounter in implementing and expanding Project Citizen?

b) What strategies are used by the Center for Civic Education and Project Citizen state coordinators to solicit teacher participation? Which have been most successful?

c) To what extent are civic leaders, business representatives, state legislators, and parents involved in Project Citizen? What factors encourage their involvement? What kinds of financial and in-kind support do they commit to the program?

Methodology: Information was gathered from all states having a Project Citizen state coordinator. Researchers gathered data through telephone interviews and written surveys with state coordinators, civic leaders, state legislators, business representatives, and teachers. For states included in site visits, researchers used supplemental telephone interviews, written surveys, and personal interviews.

Research Question 3: How are teachers integrating Project Citizen into their curricula? Which elements of the program are used (e.g., portfolio, competition, booklet)? Do teachers have sufficient interest in civic participation to teach Project Citizen? What do teachers perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?

Methodology: Information was collected primarily from teachers through telephone interviews and written surveys. For those states selected for site visits, researchers also conducted personal interviews with teachers and, when possible, observed classes participating in Project Citizen.

Research Question 4: On what types of public policy problems do students choose to focus? Are student policy recommendations adopted and implemented? If so, how?

Methodology: Researchers gathered information primarily through written surveys and interviews with state coordinators, participating teachers, and other recommended sources (e.g., news clippings, school newsletters, community leaders). For the states selected for site visits, researchers examined student portfolios and observed simulated hearings.

Research Question 5: How do students perceive their participation in Project Citizen? How do teachers perceive the effects of Project Citizen on students? Does Project Citizen raise student awareness of, understanding of, and participation in public policy issues in their communities and states?

Methodology: To assess the benefits and effects of the program relative to students' skills, attitudes, understanding, and participation, researchers gathered data primarily through personal interviews and on-site surveys, class observations, and focus groups in states selected for site visits. For states researchers did not visit, limited information was obtained through telephone interviews with teachers. Student surveys administered in 20 states in 1996-97 also were examined.

Overview of Report

Project Citizen is completing its third year of implementation as a national civic education program for middle school students. This evaluation report provides the first comprehensive look at Project Citizen and its implementation throughout the nation. It assesses the manner in which Project Citizen is administered and the strengths and weaknesses of particular implementation strategies. It also discusses teacher and student perspectives on the program's curriculum. The report concludes with overall recommendations for improving implementation activities with the goal of expanding the adoption and use of Project Citizen in schools throughout the country.

The report is organized into chapters that discuss and analyze specific topics related to the Project Citizen program. These chapters provide information about the current educational context in which Project Citizen is being used and the multiple activities related to successful expansion of the Project Citizen program into schools across the nation.

Chapter 2 examines the civic education and middle school contexts within which Project Citizen is being promoted and implemented. Chapters 3 through 9 examine, in turn, seven key topics addressed in this Project Citizen assessment: state administration, recruiting and building support among teachers and administrators, teacher training, teacher and class use, competition, benefits to students, and financial and political support; each of these chapters includes recommendations specific to its topic area. Additional information on these seven chapters is given below. Chapter 10 concludes the report by highlighting major findings of the evaluations and providing general recommendations for improving the implementation of Project Citizen. To illustrate the public policy problems addressed by Project Citizen classes, representative success stories from various states have been placed between chapters of the report. Appendix A includes state-by-state summaries of Project Citizen activity as of spring 1998; Appendix B lists

Project Citizen state coordinators; Appendixes C through G include the project's evaluation plan as well as state coordinator, teacher, and student survey forms; and Appendix H includes selected state documents illustrating Project Citizen implementation activity.

Following are brief overviews of chapters 3 through 9.

Chapter 3. State Administration describes how CCE and its volunteer network of state-based coordinators administer the Project Citizen program and provides recommendations on how to best support the activities of the state coordinator. More specifically, this chapter discusses the primary responsibilities of state coordinators; offers a profile of the people who serve in this role; describes how they are prepared and supported to carry out their duties; and addresses lessons learned through the administration of the program to date.

Chapter 4. Recruiting and Building Support Among Teachers and Administrators details promising approaches used by state coordinators to recruit teachers to use the Project Citizen curriculum; discusses factors that influence state coordinators' ability to recruit and build support among teachers and administrators for Project Citizen; details proven methods to describe the program in ways to enhance teacher participation; provides strategies to raise teacher and administrator awareness of Project Citizen; and offers recommendations to improve educator recruitment and awareness.

Chapter 5. Teacher Training highlights different methods used by state coordinators and CCE to train teachers to use Project Citizen and examines barriers that prevent state coordinators from adequately preparing teachers to use the program. This chapter concludes with a series of recommendations on how to improve training opportunities.

Chapter 6. Teacher and Class Use examines how teachers use Project Citizen in the classroom; discusses the opportunities and barriers to using Project Citizen; discusses what types of classes use Project Citizen; studies the connection between Project Citizen and state and local curricula and standards; looks at what topics are chosen for Project Citizen portfolios; and provides recommendations for facilitating the use of Project Citizen in the classroom.

Chapter 7. Competitions describes the types and level of Project Citizen competitions; identifies major barriers to participation; examines the intended outcomes of the Project Citizen experience; and provides recommendations for improving competitions at all levels.

Chapter 8. Benefits to Students highlights Project Citizen students' and teachers' perceptions of program benefits to students who have used the program, as well as their perspectives about Project Citizen, public policy, citizenship, and the strengths of the program.

Chapter 9. Financial and Political Support details successful methods for building a broad-based network of financial and political support in a state; examines empirically successful strategies for gaining financial support for the program from both state legislatures and private donors; discusses potential barriers to securing financial and political support; highlights the use of advisory committees and the roles of state coordinators, CCE, the National Conference of State Legislatures, teachers, and students in fund-raising efforts; and recommends key strategies for building on and solidifying this financial and political support.

Notes

[1] E-mail interview by Kenneth Tolo with John Hale, Associate Director, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, June 10, 1998.

[22] "Disney Launches Middle School Civics Program," *Sunburst: A Publication of the California Council for Social Studies*, vol. XVII, no. 3 (February 1993), p. 1.

[3] Center for Civic Education, "American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project: National Field Test, Goals and Actual Participation" (Calabasas, Calif., n.d.).

[4] Hale interview.

[5] Center for Civic Education, *We the People... Project Citizen Teacher's Guide* (Calabasas, Calif., 1996), p. 7.

[6] Center for Civic Education, *We the People... Project Citizen*. Online. Available: http://www.civiced.org/project_citizen.html#intro. Accessed: May 8, 1998.

[7] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, November 1997; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998. Calculations based on the average number of Project Citizen classes taught by each of the 50 responding teachers (2.6 classes) and the average size of these classes (23.88 students).

[8] Center for Civic Education, *What is the Center for Civic Education?* Online. Available: http://www.civiced.org/whatis.html. Accessed: May 8, 1998.

[9] Interview by Rachel Feit with Margaret Branson, Associate Director, Center for Civic Education, Reno, Nevada, February 17, 1998.

[10] Center for Civic Education, "History, Mission and Programs of the Center for Civic Education" (Calabasas, Calif., September 1996).

[11] Ibid.

[12] Center for Civic Education, "*We the People... Project Citizen*: An Implementation Proposal for the 1996-97 School Year" (Calabasas, Calif., n.d.), p. 1.

Chapter 2. Civic Education and Middle Schools

A constitutional democracy ... must rely upon education and example to inspire participation, a task which clearly indicates the importance of the civic mission of our schools.[1]

Tradition of Civic Education

In a democracy created of the people, by the people, and for the people, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened, informed, and engaged. The founding fathers of the United States recognized the importance of an educated citizenry for the health of the newly founded republican democracy. Thomas Jefferson declared, "Every government degenerates when trusted to the ruler of the people alone. The people themselves are its only safe depositories. And to render even them safe their minds must be improved to a certain degree."[2]

For the founders, creating an educated and informed citizenry required the creation of a public school system. Jefferson made this a major part of his life's work. Students, under his Virginia Plan, would progress through the system according to impartial examinations so that the "worth and genius" of all young people, regardless of their economic and social backgrounds, might be developed for their own benefit and that of their communities.

Once students were assembled in the schools, a liberal arts education provided them with the skills and knowledge they would need to function in a democracy. The predominant liberal arts education model held throughout the years but was challenged in the 1960s and 1970s. At this tumultuous time in U.S. history, the strength of America's democracy was tested. Americans began to distrust politicians and became cynical about the process of government. Students became disaffected with government and the political process, disillusioned with American institutions. The liberal arts education as it had previously existed seemed incapable of bringing students into the fold of civil society. The community was challenged to reengage students in civic life.

Goals and Qualities of Civic Education

In its best form, civic education combines the qualities of civic virtue, civic knowledge, and civic participation. It seeks to

1. "foster among citizens **civic dispositions** and commitments to fundamental values and principles required for competent and responsible citizenship";

2. "provide citizens the **knowledge and intellectual skills** required to monitor and influence the formulation, implementation, adjudication, and enforcement of public policy, as well as to participate in voluntary efforts to solve neighborhood and community problems"; and

3. "develop among citizens the **participatory skills** required to monitor and influence the formulation, implementation, adjudication, and enforcement of public policy, as well as to participate in voluntary efforts to solve neighborhood and community problems."[3]

Especially important in a constitutional democracy is "the widest possible civic participation of its citizens consistent with the public good and the protection of individual rights. The aim of civic education is therefore not just any kind of participation by any kind of citizen; it is the participation of **informed** and **responsible** citizens, skilled in the arts of deliberation and effective action."[4]

Civic education fosters civic competencies such as thinking, listening, talking, debating, participating, voting, evaluating, and collaborating. It teaches students about the process of government and helps them identify ways in which they can influence government and societal action in their communities. It develops informed and responsible citizens committed to democratic values and the "relevance of a civic dimension for their lives."[5]

Rationale for Civic Education

Educators today face difficult challenges as they seek to help students understand and live out their roles and responsibilities as citizens in a democracy. Three such challenges are declining civic participation, the diverse approaches to civic education in schools, and the frequent lack of effective civic education in schools.

Declining Civic Participation

More and more Americans are opting out of civic life. Two important indicators, voter turnout and membership in social clubs and organizations, show that Americans are no longer turning out to vote in high numbers or joining civic groups as often as the generation preceding them. Many independent polls and surveys support this perception of declining civic participation. For example, data from the National Election Studies show that 73 percent of the population voted in 1952 compared with 58 percent in 1994.[6] Membership records of such diverse organizations as the PTA, the Elks Club, the League of Women Voters, the Red Cross, and labor unions show that participation in many conventional voluntary associations has declined by approximately 25 to 50 percent over the past two to three decades.[7]

In search of an explanation for this decline in civic participation, theorists have suggested three primary reasons why in general most citizens do not participate in public life. First, they lack the time, money, or civic skills. Second, they choose not to do so because they lack interest or concern with politics and public issues. Finally, many feel that their participation is not desired since they are never asked to become involved, and they feel isolated from the community networks through which citizens are mobilized to act. These barriers prevent citizens from becoming more participatory.[8]

Civic education, especially programs that foster the development of participatory skills to monitor and influence public policy, could lessen these barriers. With its emphasis on engaging citizens in the policy and political process, civic education at its most practical level is about helping individuals gain the skills, knowledge, reasoning, values, and networks they need to function effectively in a democracy. Strong civic education programs, therefore, may be one of the most efficacious means for overcoming America's widespread apathy toward politics and for reestablishing the citizen's role in American democracy.

Diverse Approaches to Civic Education in Schools

Civic education often reflects the political, economic, and social climate of the times, as well as the educational norms, values, and priorities of communities and families. What is emphasized during one presidential, gubernatorial, or mayoral administration may be de-emphasized when political leaders change. What is emphasized during a time of national or international conflict may be de-emphasized during a time of economic well-being and peace. Curriculum approaches emphasized in one school and community may be significantly different from those stressed in other schools and communities.

In 1977, the Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education, a project of the Danforth Foundation and the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, pointed out that multiple approaches to civic education were used in America's schools. Among the diverse approaches identified were those that focused on (1) academic disciplines (e.g., history), (2) law-related education (e.g., legal processes, Bill of Rights), (3) social problems (e.g., crime, pollution), (4) critical thinking, (5) values clarification, (6) moral development, (7) community involvement, and (8) reform of the school as an institution within which civic education occurs.[9]

This same diversity of approaches exists today. One teacher and school may encourage values development, another law-related education, another the history of American government, and yet another community service and service learning. Thus students currently may learn about only one or two aspects of civic education rather than becoming familiar with the wide range of civic competencies necessary to participate effectively as a responsible and informed citizen. Civic education programs in schools are needed that integrate these various approaches in ways that excite and benefit students and that stimulate their lifelong participation in American political and social systems.

Lack of Effective Civic Education in Schools

Although most educators recognize the need for effective civic education both in schools and in communities, they seldom give it systematic attention; many ignore it altogether. Some middle schools and high schools may offer more than 250 courses, yet fundamental citizenship skills and values may go unlearned and unpracticed.[10]

Civic education, or education for informed and responsible citizenship, often has no clear place in the school curriculum of a middle school or a high school. Depending on state and school district requirements, as well as the education background and professional experience of a school's teachers and principal, a little civic education might be found in a history course, in a social studies course, or in the activities of an extracurricular student government, student journalism, or community service activity. Broader, integrative courses seldom are offered; rather, the attention of teachers and schools is focused on disciplinary areas that have direct relationships to state and school district proficiency tests and graduation requirements and to college entrance requirements.[11]

Two of the eight national education goals, which had their genesis in the Bush administration and were reaffirmed by the Clinton administration, address the need for civic and citizenship education. These goals state that by the year 2000

1. "all students will leave grades 4,8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including English, ... civics and government, ... and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy" (Goal 3); and

2. "every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship" (Goal 6).[12]

Yet while public education in the United States is a national priority, it is primarily a state responsibility under local control. Even though there may be a national consensus that civic education should be taught and responsible citizenship fostered in our schools, states and school districts essentially have the lead roles in the articulation and implementation of curriculum standards and assessments. While some states have explicitly included civic education in their curriculum requirements and other states have provided the flexibility in their requirements for creative teachers to give renewed emphasis to civic education, more attention needs to be given to fostering teacher and class use of civic education programs that increase civic literacy and participation and stimulate student interest in becoming responsible and informed citizens.

This is especially the case during the middle school years (grades 6-9 and ages 10-15, approximately). Too often, schools overlook middle school when developing civic education curriculum and standards. For many students, high school is their first taste of civics and citizenship education, yet by this time, students may have already opted out of the system.

Critical Middle School Years

Despite the lack of institutionalized civics curricula during the middle school years, this is a crucial time to introduce students to these concepts. The middle school years are a time when youth form values they hold throughout their lives. The Task Force on Social Studies in the Middle School notes that "[t]alents can develop rapidly during this period, as can the aptitude for critical thinking and decisionmaking."[13] This is a time when youth start to struggle with identity and purpose; it is a time during which young adolescents need opportunities to explore their independence and role in their communities. A productive educational setting for students at this stage in their lives needs to "foster exploration, creativity, inquiry, and intellectual challenge."[14] Students need teachers who are able to balance standards of academic excellence and a commitment to the development of critical thinking with supportive learning environments and opportunities to practice civic skills.[15]

Developmentally, middle school is an appropriate time for students to grapple with values like tolerance, diversity of opinion, and respect for individual worth, because it is during these years that students start moving from "concrete to abstract thinking."[16] This is a time when youth begin to develop a concern for right and wrong and start to make decisions about their lives. Thus the middle school experience should help students gain the skills and practice necessary for them to learn how to be informed and responsible citizens.

Teaching such skills to early adolescents is no easy task. Adolescence is a period of dramatic change for youth; it is a time when they are physically and emotionally growing beyond childhood but are still some distance from adulthood. The complexity of today's world creates an added burden for adolescents. Thus middle schools and their teachers face the difficult challenge of providing rigorous and engaging civic education for youth who are navigating a critical stage of development in a complex world.

The deliberateness with which middle school teachers and administrators across the country are implementing effective and successful civic education programs for their students reflects in part these challenges. What is needed is a civic education program for middle school students that connects learning to real world experience, that integrates different conceptual approaches, that benefits students and their communities, and that excites students and begins to interest them in public policy problems and the importance of responsible and active citizenship.

Project Citizen

Project Citizen was designed to develop middle school students' interest and ability to participate competently and responsibly in their state and local governments. The program combines active learning in both classrooms and communities with team-based project activity that builds a sense of citizenship and an understanding of public policy. Project Citizen teaches students how to participate in their local and state government, demonstrating the importance of engaged participation in a democratic society. The program encourages students to step outside the classroom by seeking to solve problems in their communities even after the formal portfolio is complete. Project Citizen gives 10-to-15-year-olds opportunities to participate in (and contribute to) our civil society and to practice the essential arts of critical thinking, dialogue and debate, negotiation, tolerance, consensus, and action.

Project Citizen is one of the first national civic education programs designed for middle school. These are crucial years for personal development, and it is imperative that schools begin to address civic issues during these formative years. Project Citizen provides teachers with a framework to teach civic education. It is consistent with the voluntary national standards for civics and government and with many states' requirements. Indeed, Project Citizen includes virtually all the instructional strategies recommended by the National Council for Social Studies for middle school students, and the multiple approaches to civic education identified in the Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education.[17]

Given the potential significance of Project Citizen as a middle school civic education program, the remaining chapters in this report assess the current status of Project Citizen implementation nationally, identify strategies and approaches that have promoted its implementation as well as barriers that have inhibited it, and document student and teacher perceptions of the benefits to students from participating in Project Citizen.

Notes

[1] Charles N. Quigley and Charles F. Bahmueller, ed., *CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education* (Calabasas, Calif.: Center for Civic Education, 1991), p. 39.

[2] Ibid., p. 11.

[3] Ibid., p. 1.

[4] Ibid., p. 3.

[5] Ibid., p. 5.

[6] National Election Studies, *The 1952–1994 Time-Series Data Collections*. Online. Available: http://www/umich.edu/~nes/resources/resources.htm. Accessed: May 4, 1998.

[7] Robert D. Putnam, "The Strange Disappearance of Civic America," *The American Prospect* (Winter 1996), p. 35.

[8] Henry E. Brady, "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation," *American Political Science Review* (June 1995), p. 271.

[9] B. Frank Brown, ed., *Education for Responsible Citizenship: The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education*. The Danforth Foundation and the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Charles F. Kettering Foundation (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1977), pp. 180-185.

[10] Richard M. Battisoni, *Public Schooling and the Education of Democratic Citizens* (Jackson, Miss.: University Press of Mississippi, 1985), p. 96.

[11] Peter S. Hlebowitsh, "Citizenship: The 'Lost Social Mandate of the Public School'," *Education Week*, vol. 17, no. 28 (March 25, 1998), p. 38.

[12] U.S. Department of Education, *A Teacher's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education*, 4th ed. (Washington, D.C., Fall 1995), p. 5.

[13] National Council for the Social Studies, "Social Studies in the Middle School." Position statement of the Task Force on Social Studies in the Middle School of the National Council for the Social Studies. *Social Education*, vol. 55 (September 1991), p. 292.

[14] Ibid., p. 293.

[15] National Staff Development Council, "Filling a Crack in the Middle: The Need for Staff Development in the Middle Grades." Background paper prepared for the Results-Based Staff Development for the Middle Grades Initiative (Oxford, Ohio, December 1997), p. 1.

[16] National Council for the Social Studies, "Social Studies in the Middle School," p. 289.

[17] Ibid., pp. 287-293; and B. Frank Brown, ed., *Education for Responsible Citizenship: The Report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education*. The Danforth Foundation and the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, pp. 180-185.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

World Wide Web Research Puts California Classroom on the Map

Alan Haskvitz's eighth-grade class at Suzanne Middle School in Walnut, California, tackled most of its project through the Internet. The students researched the problem of low voter turnout on-line and corresponded with a range of sources, from Australia to South Africa. After researching what other countries, states, and counties do to promote voting, the students ended up putting together a list of recommendations to boost voter turnout in Los Angeles County. "The level of their research and its scope is phenomenal," commented Conny McCormack, the Los Angeles County registrar. The students' recommendations are on their own web page (http://www.umall.com/suzweb), which includes links to other sites with information about voting and e-mail addresses for Los Angeles County elected officials.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Roy Erickson, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Fair Oaks, California, September 29, 1997, and "Students Lauded for Voting Project," *San Gabriel Valley Tribune* (May 28, 1997).

Chapter 3. State Administration

Responsibility for implementing Project Citizen throughout the United States and its territories lies with the 45 Project Citizen state coordinators appointed by the CCE.[1] This chapter describes the primary responsibilities of the state coordinators; offers a profile of the people who serve in this role; describes how they are prepared and supported to carry out their duties; and offers lessons learned about the administration of Project Citizen throughout the nation.

Responsibilities and Duties

According to CCE, the role of the state coordinator is to organize and administer all aspects of the state-level Project Citizen program. While CCE assists state coordinators by providing some of the initial contacts, a state coordinator is responsible for assuming primary responsibility for developing contacts, recruiting and building support among teachers, and providing training to teachers. When selected, each state coordinator agrees to the following duties:

1. initiate contacts with key members of local and state legislatures, local and state governmental agencies, community-based civic organizations, the education community, and other civic-minded individuals to obtain endorsement and support for the program;
2. develop a plan for dividing the state into districts or regions for administering and implementing the program;
3. develop an appropriate state budget;
4. secure needed funding to implement the program in the state;
5. recruit and train an in-state network of program coordinators;
6. disseminate program materials to interested schools and teachers;
7. provide in-service training for participating teachers; and
8. organize and conduct a statewide competition.[2]

Our research has found that the extent to which state coordinators are fulfilling these Project Citizen administrative responsibilities varies considerably across the nation. A significant factor contributing to the mixed results is that a state coordinator basically serves as a volunteer. In the absence of a formal written agreement with CCE, a state coordinator often is unable or unwilling to invest extensive time to develop Project Citizen. According to our survey of state coordinators to which 35 responses were received (see table 3.1), 80 percent reported they spend between 1 and 5 hours a week working on the program and 17 percent reported spending between 6 and 10 hours a week. Only one state coordinator reported spending over 10 hours a week on the program.[3]

Table 3.1
Average Hours Per Week State Coordinator Spends on Project Citizen

Hours	**Number of Respondents**	**Percentage of Respondents**
Zero	0	0
Between 1 and 5	28	80
Between 6 and 10	6	17
More than 10	1	3

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

To help state coordinators get started with state-level implementation, CCE has provided each state up to ten sets of Project Citizen materials per year. Each set contains 30 student texts and a teacher's guide that regularly retails for $150. Each state coordinator also receives an annual $500 stipend from CCE to cover some of the costs of implementing Project Citizen. Clearly, this allocation is extremely limited. Therefore CCE encourages state coordinators to concentrate their time and effort on securing additional funding to implement the program by working with members of their state legislatures, local governing agencies, appropriate civic organizations, and public or private foundations.

Profile of State Coordinators

According to CCE, ideally a state coordinator is someone who knows the education community in the state and has experience working with various political constituencies.[4] Thus professionals of diverse backgrounds serve as Project Citizen state coordinators. Our research found that most people serving as state coordinators are working full-time in other positions (see appendix B). As a result, their biggest constraint often is not having enough time to devote to Project Citizen implementation, particularly without additional financial compensation. As one state coordinator put it, the effort at times is "catch as catch can."

For the most part, CCE has relied on people familiar with other CCE education programs to serve as state coordinators. Currently, 34 of the 45 state coordinators also serve CCE as *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state or district coordinators.[5] A total of 31 state coordinators characterize themselves as educators, currently working as teachers or education administrators. Seventeen state coordinators are affiliated with institutions promoting law, government, or civic education for the communities in which they serve. A few state coordinators are retirees.

Examples of the positions that state coordinators hold include law-related education institution staff, administrative officer of a court's juvenile services division, retired social studies teacher, school administrator, president of a state's council of social studies, professor, political campaign volunteer, school board member, candidate for a state legislature, and head of a center for the prevention of school violence.

The greatest commonality among state coordinators is that they are people who are professionally committed to educating young people. They are committed to instilling an understanding of community involvement and civic participation, with the hope that positive experiences with such processes will stay with children as they grow into adults. As one state coordinator put it: "I love to see kids learn, and if I see that happening, it doesn't matter what it takes, or how much it costs. We'll do it."[6]

Administrative Support for the State Coordinator

The amount of state-level administrative support state coordinators have varies greatly among the states, primarily because there often has been no funding available beyond the $500 from CCE to support implementation. Without financial resources to hire administrative support, state coordinators are expected to recruit volunteers to help with Project Citizen implementation on a district or regional level.

According to the survey respondents, the majority of state coordinators depend on their state's *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators (and state coordinators, if the Project Citizen coordinator does not serve in both roles) to help with logistical needs in Project Citizen implementation (see table 3.2).[7] At least nine state coordinators are fortunate to have administrative support at their place of primary employment on which they can draw.

Table 3.2
Administrative Support for Project Citizen State Coordinator

Source of Administrative Support	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
We the People... District Coordinator	13	38
Employee that Works in State Coordinator's Organization	9	27
We the People... State Coordinator	4	12
Individual Teacher	4	12
Friend	2	6
Someone Hired for the Specific Purpose	2	6
Other	2	6

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

Note: Percentages add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

The majority of state coordinators responded that they receive only minimal administrative assistance on the state level, if they have any help at all.[8] Ten state coordinators said they receive some administrative assistance from individuals at law-related institutions, such as the state's law-related education organization, the bar association, or the court system. Thirteen state coordinators responded that they receive limited administrative support from their state's *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators. Ten state coordinators said that they have no administrative help. Thus Project Citizen state coordinators affiliated with one or more education networks most often find logistical help in carrying out such tasks as distributing program information to teachers and organizing teacher training sessions, hearings, or competitions in their respective states.

Working Relationship with CCE

Our project gave state coordinators their first systematic opportunity to comment on the implementation of Project Citizen in their respective states and on their working relationship with CCE. The December 1997 state coordinators' survey asked respondents to rate the responsiveness of CCE in meeting each of five Project Citizen program needs, as well as the overall responsiveness of CCE to state coordinators' needs (using a rating scale in which 1=poor, 2=adequate, 3=good, and 4=excellent).[9] As shown in table 3.3, the overall responsiveness of CCE in meeting state coordinators' program needs was rated high, receiving an average rating of 3.5. Among the respondents, 62 percent rated CCE's overall responsiveness "excellent," while an additional 21 percent rated it "good." CCE's responsiveness in providing Project Citizen materials was rated even higher, namely, 3.8; 77 percent of the responding state coordinators rated CCE "excellent" and 12 percent "good."

Table 3.3
Responsiveness of CCE in Meeting Project Citizen State Coordinators' Program Needs

Program Needs	Average Response
Project Citizen Materials	3.8
Assistance in Securing Funding	2.7
Teacher Training	2.7
Assistance with Recruiting Teachers	2.5
Financial Support	2.0
OVERALL	3.5

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

Note: Average Response: 1=Poor, 2=Adequate, 3=Good, 4=Excellent

Ratings of CCE's responsiveness in meeting the needs of state coordinators in the other four program areas in table 3.3 ranged from 2.0 to 2.7. In each of these four areas except "Financial Support," more than half of the responding state coordinators rated CCE's responsiveness "excellent" or "good"; however, with respect to "Financial Support," more than 60 percent of the responding coordinators rated CCE's responsiveness "poor" or "adequate." Thus there is significant variation among state coordinators with respect to their expectations of what CCE could or should provide to meet Project Citizen implementation needs in the states. Variations in state coordinators' ratings also might reflect greater attention by CCE to implementation needs in some states than in others.

Training State Coordinators

State coordinators' ability to implement and administer Project Citizen is primarily dependent on their individual skills as education program administrators, as well as their knowledge of other CCE programs, since there are few training opportunities available to them.[10] The survey respondents who said they had received some Project Citizen "training" from CCE are included among the 34 (of 45) Project Citizen state coordinators who serve a dual role as *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state or district coordinators.[11] These individuals participate in the annual CCE summer conference for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinators. At the June 1997 conference, for example, a Project Citizen breakout session was offered; however, that session was more a Project Citizen promotion and awareness session than a training session specifically geared to enhance the implementation and administration skills needed by the Project Citizen state coordinators.

Although some state coordinators have experience with administering education programs, few have fund-raising experience. There is wide agreement that the program needs more funding in order to increase its scope and effectiveness. However, there is no consensus about whose responsibility it is to raise funds for Project Citizen. When issues of funding for Project Citizen were discussed with state coordinators in telephone interviews, several state coordinators said that it was not the responsibility of CCE to provide additional funding to the states, while others said that it was very important for CCE to obtain federal funding for Project Citizen to increase the amount of funds available to each state.[12] These varied responses reflect state coordinators' diverse, often contradictory, views about the scope of their activities and responsibilities.

Another issue about which state coordinators have varied opinions is what the Project Citizen program should look like in the future. Many state coordinators remarked that Project Citizen appears to have programmatic goals similar to those of *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. For example, these coordinators believe there will be future Project Citizen national competitions at which middle school students will defend their public policy recommendations in a judged public hearing. Other state coordinators expressed the view that primary emphasis should be placed on developing Project Citizen as a state program, particularly if funding is provided by state legislatures or other state or local public and private sources.

Such different views about what form Project Citizen should take in the future have significant implications for the design and implementation of training programs for state coordinators. Unless there is agreement among state coordinators and with CCE about the priority areas on which state coordinators should concentrate their scarce time and resources and on which training sessions should be conducted, Project Citizen is unlikely to develop into a truly national program that is administered consistently across the states.

Moreover, training all state coordinators in a central location might be necessary in order to achieve the common vision for the program and the programmatic consistency across states that CCE desires. This could be an expensive endeavor, however, unless it were conducted in conjunction with events such as CCE's annual summer meeting for all *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinators.

Lessons Learned

State Coordinator as Entrepreneur

Progress in Project Citizen implementation across the country in this early stage varies and is substantially influenced by the level of skill and activity of state coordinators, as well as by their available resources. CCE and teacher expectations about what activities state coordinators should be able to carry out are at times unrealistic, given the backgrounds and resources of the state coordinators. To increase the likelihood of success, CCE should be confident that each state coordinator it appoints has the capabilities of an education program administrator and the administrative support necessary to implement Project Citizen effectively. Successful state coordinators may be able to achieve and enhance this administrative support through collaboration with education institutions (e.g., universities and colleges of teacher education, law-related education institutions, and crime prevention organizations) that see Project Citizen as having learning objectives that are complementary to those that their institutions promote.

Some state coordinators show remarkable flexibility and creativity in their strategies for implementing Project Citizen under current funding conditions and in view of the current environment in their respective states. In one state, for example, when the state coordinator learned that a teacher and students could not travel to a regional Project Citizen hearing because on that day all the buses were reserved for the football team, the coordinator was able to convince the principal to make a bus available and enable the students to participate in the hearing. In another instance, the same state coordinator learned that a Project Citizen class would not be able to make a deadline for a portfolio submission and hence would not be able to participate in a competition; working with the teacher, she extended the portfolio submission deadline, thereby enabling the class to participate.

Time and Availability

Two issues present themselves when addressing the time and availability of state coordinators to implement Project Citizen on the state level. One, when busy professionals who have other full-time positions are appointed to serve as essentially volunteer Project Citizen state coordinators, they frequently are unable to invest much time and effort in program implementation. These individuals often are already fully committed to their regular jobs and have little incentive to overextend themselves.

A special situation exists when individuals who have the responsibility to administer other civic education programs in their states are appointed as Project Citizen state coordinators. In this situation, established support networks can be used to implement Project Citizen, but at the same time these existing networks may lead to the implementation of Project Citizen in ways that reflect the purposes and priorities of the existing civic education programs rather than those of Project Citizen. For example, when an individual who serves as a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinator is appointed as a Project Citizen state coordinator, the Project

Citizen program may be implemented in a manner similar to the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program rather than according to CCE's Project Citizen objectives and guidelines. While this "dual appointment" strategy may make sense considering the limited funding and administrative support resources available in many states, it may not be a useful long-term programmatic strategy for implementing Project Citizen.

A second issue relates to those state coordinators who are retired from their respective professions. On the one hand, they may have more time to serve as a volunteer Project Citizen state coordinator. On the other hand, they may have lost the administrative support provided by their former places of employment. This could create a significant problem when such a state coordinator seeks financial support, because state legislatures and other funding sources often provide program administration funds only to institutions, not to individuals serving in a noninstitutional volunteer capacity. Retirees appointed as state coordinators should be able to demonstrate that they are able to gain the endorsement and support of institutions and individuals necessary to provide some degree of sustainability to the Project Citizen program in the state. Since a retiree also is likely to work relatively independently in implementing Project Citizen, it is important that the "institutional knowledge" of Project Citizen implementation in a state not be lost when such a state coordinator leaves his or her position.

State-Level Program Sustainability

Limited resources is likely to be a barrier to statewide Project Citizen implementation in many states for the next few years. To overcome this problem, state coordinators will be expected to develop more comprehensive Project Citizen implementation plans and fund-raising strategies in their respective states. But a state coordinator will not succeed if he or she is the only person leading the statewide implementation effort. A state coordinator must be able and willing to seek the active involvement of appropriate organizations and individuals in Project Citizen implementation, thereby building a statewide base for the program that can be sustained.

A critical step for a state coordinator is identifying the key organizations and individuals whose involvement in Project Citizen implementation is critical to its success, and then gaining and retaining their active and enthusiastic involvement in providing program leadership. One way to achieve this is the creation of a statewide advisory committee for Project Citizen, provided that the committee's role and scope is carefully articulated relative to the responsibilities of the state coordinator and the expectations of CCE.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that there may exist in-state obstacles not controllable by the state coordinator that could hamper the creation of a sustainable environment for Project Citizen. For example, in one state the state coordinator was able, after considerable effort and assistance from key state leaders, to gain state legislative approval for Project Citizen funding, only to have the governor then line-item veto the appropriation. This state coordinator's activities also are restricted by state rules on who can lobby the legislature. In another state, a large corporate base is lacking, thereby limiting opportunities for the state coordinator in that state to obtain private funding for Project Citizen. Moreover, a number of states are facing major challenges in funding or reforming their education systems, thus obtaining statewide support for a program like Project Citizen that may not be linked explicitly with state education standards or funding formulas is often exceedingly difficult.

Communication

Good communication within any institution or institutional network is a necessity if that organization is to be strong and effective. Project Citizen state coordinators are a valuable resource and a source of information and insights to both CCE staff and other state coordinators around the country. This information resource is not adequately used at the present time; there is much room for improving communication between CCE and state coordinators, and among the state coordinators themselves. Establishing national and regional networks among the state coordinators and CCE could tap into this vital resource.

The expanded use of basic computing software and technology that is compatible among all state coordinators and CCE could substantially enhance their communication with each other. One state coordinator noted that communication between state coordinators and CCE was inhibited by the inability of CCE's computer systems to read materials sent by the states. Also, while 31 of the 45 state coordinators report having e-mail accounts and others may have them as well, all should have e-mail capability in order to enable CCE and state coordinators to share Project Citizen program information and plans routinely and inexpensively. Additionally, telephone conferencing and video conferencing often are effective ways of achieving a shared program vision and exchanging information, ideas, and insights within an institutional network similar to CCE's state coordinator network.

During one project telephone interview, a state coordinator expressed the view that while CCE had not addressed all the coordinator's support needs, it had provided contact with another state coordinator, and this link had been very helpful. While better communication among state coordinators can not substitute for additional administrative support assistance in implementing Project Citizen on a broader scale in states, such communication could enhance the feeling among state coordinators that they truly are significant parts of a national civic education program.

Recommendations

Based on the information and insights gained through our research, following are recommendations to improve the state administration of Project Citizen.

1. CCE should take the lead in improving communication, particularly electronic, between its staff and Project Citizen state coordinators. As soon as possible, every state coordinator should have easy and regular e-mail access that enables CCE and the state coordinators to communicate inexpensively, reliably, and regularly with each other. This may require CCE to provide assistance to some state coordinators to bring them on-line; it also may require that CCE enhance its own computing systems to enable it to receive varied materials from state coordinators. Establishing such electronic linkages is only the first step, however. CCE and a representative group of state coordinators should jointly develop and implement ways in which CCE and state coordinators can each meet the needs of the other through the communication of Project Citizen-related information, ideas, and insights electronically (e.g., a listserv on which to transmit CCE weekly or monthly updates, as well as information about state-level Project Citizen successes and events).

2. *Project Citizen state coordinators and CCE staff should work together to develop clear and mutually agreed upon expectations regarding program outcomes and their respective responsibilities in implementing and administering Project Citizen.* CCE should ensure that state coordinators and CCE staff share the long-term vision for Project Citizen, as well as agree on the broad strategies needed nationally and at the state level to achieve this vision. For example, is Project Citizen to be a national program in which all state Project Citizen programs are uniformly implemented and administered, or a national "confederation" of state Project Citizen programs that have a common core but that otherwise differ in their details?

3. *CCE, in collaboration with representative state coordinators, should foster and improve communication and information sharing among Project Citizen state coordinators.* The implementation of a basic electronic network connecting CCE staff and all state coordinators is a critical initial step (see recommendation 1 above). Through such a network, any state coordinator could communicate directly with any other state coordinator, thereby enabling them to draw on each other's implementation experiences, to share program successes and concerns, and to brainstorm with each other about such shared challenges as fund-raising. Until such electronic communication is operational, CCE should regularly share with all state coordinators updated information on state coordinators' names, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and e-mail addresses.

4. *CCE should foster opportunities for state coordinators to enhance Project Citizen program effectiveness and visibility, strengthen their administrative skills, and improve their understanding of the Project Citizen program.* CCE must have confidence in the abilities of state coordinators to fulfill program responsibilities; individuals hired to serve as state coordinators should have (or be capable of gaining) access to good education networks in their respective states, program management experience, and an entrepreneurial orientation. Upon the appointment of each state coordinator and regularly thereafter, CCE should work with that coordinator to identify collaboratively what specific steps he or she might take to improve his or her state administration of Project Citizen. For example, one state coordinator's professional development plan might include "meeting with the leadership of key legislative education committees," while another coordinator's plan might include "attending special seminars on grant writing and fundraising." State coordinators would be expected to assume the primary responsibility in identifying relevant opportunities to achieve the objectives of their respective plans.

5. *CCE should work with Project Citizen state coordinators to develop a manual for implementing, administering, and sustaining a successful statewide Project Citizen program.* This manual could incorporate key strategies and lessons learned by state coordinators as well as CCE guidance on how to deal with the issues and problems facing state coordinators who may be relatively inexperienced in statewide program administration. This manual would not replicate existing Project Citizen books, which are for teacher and student use and focus on portfolio preparation and presentation in the classroom. CCE also could provide state coordinators with sample materials (e.g., press releases, letters to the editor, fund-raising letters), lists of state people who might provide endorsements and support (e.g., civic leaders, foundation executives), and materials prepared by other groups (e.g., National

Conference of State Legislatures material on the basics of lawmaking and state government policymaking).

6. *Each Project Citizen state coordinator should establish a statewide Project Citizen Advisory Committee.* In order to create an infrastructure within each state to sustain the Project Citizen program, it is important to achieve a commitment to Project Citizen statewide. The advisory committee in a state would not manage the day-by-day state administration of Project Citizen; that would still be the responsibility of the state coordinator. Rather, the committee would assist and support the state coordinator in the articulation, implementation, and assessment of statewide program strategies, plans, and priorities, as well as in enhancing legislative, corporate, school system, and local community understanding of and support (financial as well as political and societal) for the program. Initially, CCE should work with state coordinators to develop general guidelines and procedures that improve the potential for achieving the objectives of these advisory committees. CCE also should work with each state coordinator to identify potential committee members in his or her state.

7. *To the extent program resources permit, CCE should consider altering its current system for allocating financial resources and Project Citizen classroom materials among the states to take into account state size and population.* Thus, for example, CCE might implement a materials distribution formula that both provides a base allocation of Project Citizen classroom material sets to each state and also provides additional sets to a state based on the number of its congressional districts. A similar two-tier system might be introduced by CCE in allocating administrative support funding to state coordinators. Instead of each state coordinator receiving $500 per year from CCE (as was the case in 1997-98), CCE might consider giving each state a base dollar amount, then providing each state a supplemental amount based on the number of its congressional districts. This could provide a financial incentive for state coordinators in the larger and more populous state to expand their Project Citizen program activities (e.g., conduct more competitions).

Notes

[1] It is anticipated that all U.S. states and territories will have a Project Citizen state coordinator in the near future.

[2] Center for Civic Education, "*We the People... Project Citizen*: Implementation Planning for the 1997-1998 School Year," Calabasas, Calif., 1997 (Information handout).

[3] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[4] E-mail interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Michael Fischer, Director, *We the People... Project Citizen*, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, March 25, 1998.

[5] Each state has a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator and congressional district coordinators who assist the Center for Civic Education with program administration.

[6] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tallahassee, Florida, February 10, 1998.

[7] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[8] A total of 37 Project Citizen state coordinators were interviewed by telephone between October 1997 and May 1998 by research team members for supplemental information regarding implementation of Project Citizen in their respective states.

[9] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[10] Fischer interview.

[11] A total of 37 Project Citizen state coordinators were interviewed by telephone between October 1997 and May 1998 by research team members for supplemental information regarding implementation of Project Citizen in their respective states.

[12] Ibid.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

Colorado Students Take to the Streets to Help Homeless Teens

At West High School in Denver, Colorado, students in Susan Hadinger's social studies elective class took to the streets for Project Citizen—literally. Their project started with the class identifying adolescents in conflict with their families as a community problem. The students decided that many young people living on the streets "don't know that help is out there and don't know where to go to get it," according to student Davonna Lopez. To help homeless teens, Hadinger's class of college-bound and "at-risk" students decided to put together a brochure with phone numbers that homeless teens could call for help. "Everybody needs help sometime, but they don't know who to ask," explained Lopez. To get background on the issue, the students went to the State Capitol and reviewed bills affecting young people; they also interviewed a magistrate at the city hall about troubled teens. As they compiled phone numbers of counseling services, homeless shelters, crisis lines, and potential employers, the students checked each phone number so that "when they call, they'll get a real person," explained student Yen Huynh. Throughout this process, the students disagreed and battled over what steps their class should take. "We argued a lot," observed student Rosa Martinez. In the end, however, the students succeeded at their goal. They produced 1,000 pamphlets that read: "Your life is your own, take control" and listed helpful phone numbers. Hadinger's class then took to the streets and distributed them to homeless teens throughout Denver. "Maybe not all kids will want [the brochure], but if one kid uses one of these phone numbers, we will have completed what we set out to do," concluded Lopez.[1]

---

[1] Bill Briggs, "Passing the Word to Runaways: Class Action," *Denver Post* (May 22, 1997), p. E-1.

Chapter 4. Recruiting and Building Support Among Teachers and Administrators

The primary responsibility for recruiting teachers to use Project Citizen and for building Project Citizen support among teachers and administrators lies with the Project Citizen state coordinators. Given state-by-state opportunities and challenges, these coordinators have developed and are carrying out creative and flexible program implementation strategies to fulfill this responsibility.

This chapter examines selected factors that influence state coordinators' ability to recruit and build support among teachers and administrators for Project Citizen; state coordinator approaches to recruit teachers and administrators for Project Citizen participation; state coordinator strategies to raise teacher and administrator awareness of Project Citizen; and recommendations to improve educator recruitment and awareness.

Factors Influencing State Coordinators' Success in Recruitment and Outreach

Four critical factors influence Project Citizen state coordinators' success in recruiting and building support for Project Citizen among teachers and administrators: time availability, organizational assistance, funding, and experience.

Time Availability

The amount of time state coordinators can commit to Project Citizen has a significant impact on the success of their recruitment and outreach strategies. There is no consistency among states with respect to the amount of time and effort coordinators commit to these activities. Some coordinators, such as those in Arizona and North Carolina, seek to recruit a specific number of teachers per year. Others, such as the Maine coordinator, only recruit during a portion of the year regardless of the number of teachers recruited. Most state coordinators, like those in Pennsylvania and California, commit themselves to building support among teachers and administrators year-round.

Although state coordinators' time commitments to recruitment and outreach vary, most coordinators report they would like to spend additional time on these activities. Eighty-five percent of respondents to a survey of all state coordinators noted that they would do more Project Citizen teacher outreach if they had the time.[1]

Organizational Assistance

Due to the limited time state coordinators have to devote to Project Citizen, the organizational assistance they have to implement their recruitment and outreach strategies is critically important. When Project Citizen state coordinators can rely on regional or district coordinators to work directly with an existing network of teachers, then the state coordinators can concentrate on expanding the network and acquiring program funds. Essentially, these state coordinators can be more proactive and systematic in their recruitment and outreach efforts than can those state coordinators who work alone.

Project Citizen state coordinator recruitment and outreach networks vary by state. CCE encourages these state coordinators to use and build on the existing *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* network of teachers and coordinators for support; nearly all do so, although to varying degrees. As shown in table 3.2, 38 percent of Project Citizen state coordinators use *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators for assistance with Project Citizen. The Pennsylvania state coordinator recruits volunteer regional coordinators who are not affiliated with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. These regional coordinators are most often teachers, but they also have education administration and law backgrounds; some are retirees. A few state coordinators, such as those in Pennsylvania, Kentucky and Ohio, rely on an organizational colleague to assist them in recruitment and outreach. These are more the exception than the rule, however, since many state coordinators have developed no network to assist them in these activities.

It is beneficial for coordinators to collaborate among themselves in their recruitment and outreach efforts. In Pennsylvania, two of the Project Citizen regional coordinators speak somewhat regularly; at the same time, however, two others had never spoken to each other until early 1998. During a project conference call with three of these regional coordinators, all of them indicated that they found it helpful to discuss with their colleagues such logistical issues as how many in-class hours they tell teachers Project Citizen requires, what methods they use to reach teachers, and what types of assistance teachers need after training. This type of communication, while not common, can help coordinators improve their recruitment and outreach methods. A significant obstacle to such communication is the extra time it requires from already very busy volunteers.[2]

Funding

State funds for Project Citizen teacher recruitment and outreach come from a variety of sources. In 1997-98, all Project Citizen state coordinators are receiving a $500 annual stipend from CCE, and most are using a portion of it for recruitment and outreach. Some coordinators are able to use the resources of the agency in which they are primarily employed for Project Citizen outreach (e.g., photocopying, paper supplies, e-mail, web sites, envelopes, stamps). This is often the case for state coordinators who work for education or law-related organizations, but it is rarely the case for teachers or retirees. Some state coordinators, including those in Nevada, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, have been successful in acquiring funds in their respective states (e.g., from the state legislature) that help pay for recruitment and outreach expenses.

Various state coordinators believe that if CCE increased its financial support for Project Citizen, their recruitment and outreach efforts would be more successful. [Indeed, as shown in table 3.3, state coordinators rate CCE as relatively unresponsive in meeting their financial needs. They rate CCE's responsiveness in this area as "Poor" to "Adequate."] In our research project, state coordinators suggested a variety of ways additional funds would be spent. If funds were available, they could be used to pay school districts to hire substitute teachers so that regular teachers could more readily attend Project Citizen orientation and training sessions,[3] and coordinators who are teachers could leave the classroom temporarily to promote the program.[4] Coordinators could also distribute more mailings, newsletters, and informational flyers, as well as make phone calls, to promote Project Citizen. Extra funds could be used by a state coordinator to purchase additional sets of Project Citizen classroom materials for an expanded number of teachers,[5] or to discount Project Citizen materials for lower income school districts to encourage their participation.[6]

Despite the state coordinators' frequently expressed belief that more funds would lead to more successful recruitment and outreach, some states with grant funds to support these activities have accomplished little to date. At the same time, Alabama, Virginia, and New Mexico coordinators have no grant funds but have been able to recruit many teachers into the Project Citizen program, with 15, 17, and 21 teachers having used Project Citizen in these states, respectively.

Experience

A state coordinator's recruitment and outreach experience prior to assuming the Project Citizen position influences the comprehensiveness and success of his or her strategies, and this experience is varied. State coordinators in Indiana, Arizona, and Florida gained significant experience in recruiting and building support among teachers and administrators as *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinators. Others, such as the Pennsylvania coordinator, developed such skills in their prior professional careers. Yet most state coordinators have little experience and lack confidence in their recruitment and outreach abilities; such coordinators often struggle in implementing Project Citizen.

Time, funds, and assistance from coordinators and staff are helpful for recruitment and outreach; however, experience may be the most important. Even without much of the first three factors, state coordinators with experience, motivation, and entrepreneurship often have success in recruitment and outreach. Allocating funds to a state coordinator with little experience in or potential for successful recruitment and outreach is not always effective. Our research shows that the states with motivated and experienced state coordinators have expanded their respective programs despite scarce startup resources.

Recruitment Approaches: Deciding Whom to Target

Project Citizen state coordinators use various approaches to identify which teachers and administrators to target relative to potential Project Citizen participation. This section examines bottom-up and top-down approaches, statewide and region-specific approaches, and teacher targeting approaches.

Bottom-Up and Top-Down Recruitment Approaches

Generally speaking, our research shows that Project Citizen state coordinators take either a bottom-up or a top-down recruitment approach with respect to their target audiences (i.e., teachers, principals, curriculum directors, and other administrators). In other words, they direct their efforts at teachers, who seek to develop support from principals and other school administrators, or they focus on school administrators or external funders, who in different ways stimulate teachers to participate in Project Citizen.

About half of all state coordinators, especially those who teach, focus their marketing efforts directly on teachers. This bottom-up approach provides a direct link to teachers, which in turn makes it easier for state coordinators to track teachers and classrooms using Project Citizen, offer teacher training and continued support, and develop knowledgeable program advocates who later may be able to assist the state coordinator in outreach. This approach is reflective of the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* model, which is built on an established network of program coordinators, teachers, and administrators.

A disadvantage of the bottom-up approach for Project Citizen is that it may not lead to institutionalization of the program, which is critically important for a new program like Project Citizen. From year to year, teachers may move to new schools, teach different grade levels or subject areas, or retire. Thus teachers not only have to use the program but also have to ensure that their principals, curriculum directors, or other administrators become advocates for the program's continued use. In Maine and Kentucky, for example, teacher turnover has caused the discontinuation of Project Citizen in some schools where a principal or a curriculum director did not institutionalize its use.

Alternatively, other state coordinators have adopted a top-down approach. Rather than focusing on the teachers and trying to recruit their participation, they focus on principals, curriculum directors, local education boards, or state education department administrators. The main advantage to this approach is that Project Citizen is more likely to be institutionalized in schools and school districts when administrators or curriculum directors become its advocate. Educators in these positions do not change jobs as often as teachers change classrooms or subject areas; thus their support promotes sustained use over time. Their support also is important in terms of assuring teachers that Project Citizen meets state standards and of providing resources for Project Citizen classroom materials or competitions. Another advantage is that school administrators often are in a better position than coordinators to know which teachers are likely to use Project Citizen. Some state coordinators have found it most useful to target curriculum directors, since they have the greatest access to teachers and often make curriculum decisions in schools.

Other state coordinators employ a different type of top-down approach, namely, one that seeks to obtain state-level funding for Project Citizen implementation, then use the available resources to stimulate participation by principals, curriculum directors, and classroom teachers. While this top-down approach differs from that focusing solely on schools and school districts, it nonetheless seeks the same end result—use of Project Citizen by classroom teachers and the institutionalization of the program.

One disadvantage of the school-focused top-down approach is that teachers may approach the use of Project Citizen less enthusiastically if it is recommended to them by an administrator than if they had been contacted directly. Another potential problem is that, with one or more additional "layers" between the state coordinator and the teacher, the likelihood of a teacher not fully understanding the objectives, principles, guidelines, and processes associated with the use of Project Citizen in the classroom and the community is greater than if the state coordinator had explained directly to the teacher what the program seeks to accomplish. A significant disadvantage of the external funding-initiated top-down approach is that funding may be withdrawn suddenly, perhaps leading to the cessation of Project Citizen activity.

In spite of these disadvantages, several state coordinators are actively using one or more top-down approaches to recruit Project Citizen teachers, since many coordinators have close professional contacts among principals, curriculum directors, local boards of education, and even state education department officials or state legislators. The following examples highlight several of these approaches.

State Departments of Education

- The Pennsylvania state coordinator sought to expand Project Citizen and recruit more teachers into the program by lobbying the Executive Deputy Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Education for state funding. The Department endorsed Project Citizen and allocated $31,380.[7]

State Legislatures

- In Nevada, the state coordinator arranged for Project Citizen students to present their portfolio to the Nevada Legislature. The legislature subsequently endorsed Project Citizen and allocated $32,000 to assist in expanding Project Citizen into more classrooms.[8]

Local Boards of Education

- Although no State of Washington local board of education has yet officially endorsed Project Citizen, the state coordinator's strategy is to attend conferences that board members attend in order to inform them about Project Citizen and elicit their support. She believes that Project Citizen is compatible with state education standards and that it is important for school boards to "legitimize" the program. Once legitimized in this way, the program will be more attractive for teachers to use.[9]

Middle School Principals

- Project Citizen state and regional coordinators in California make concerted efforts to reach out to principals. These coordinators believe that if they are able to sell the program to school administrators, then teachers will use it. Regional coordinators presented Project Citizen at the California League of Middle Schools conference, which is attended by administrators; they plan to send a letter to all middle school principals as well.[10]

- Regional coordinators in Pennsylvania make phone calls to middle school principals to raise awareness about Project Citizen, using a listing of principals' phone numbers produced by the Department of Education. The coordinators believe focusing on principals is effective, because principals who are convinced of the value of Project Citizen will in turn become advocates for its use by interested teachers.[11]

- State coordinator outreach directed at local school administrators has been successful in Florida. At 1997 Project Citizen teacher training sessions in Miami and Tampa, 10 of the 34 teachers completing an evaluation form noted they attended the training because they were invited to do so by their principal or curriculum director.[12]

Curriculum Directors and Supervisors at School and District Levels

- In Pennsylvania, in an effort to expand Project Citizen, a teacher recruited the support of her curriculum director. Because of the curriculum director's support, all eighth grade social studies teachers in his school must use either Project Citizen or a similar program as a supplement to their class.

- The Florida state coordinator has developed good relationships with administrators at the district level in Florida. The social studies supervisors in Hillsborough County and Miami-Dade County support Project Citizen and have sponsored trainings for teachers. Hillsborough County is considering promoting Project Citizen for use in middle school gifted and honors classes. Miami-Dade County is considering a proposal to sponsor annually a "civics bee."

Statewide Recruitment and Region-Specific Recruitment Approaches

In articulating their respective recruitment and outreach strategies, Project Citizen state coordinators must decide what type of geographic coverage they want. Three approaches are being employed by coordinators: the region-specific approach, the statewide approach, and a hybrid of the two.

Many coordinators use a region-specific approach, choosing to focus their energy and attention on their immediate communities or on the communities surrounding the cities within which they live, especially when first implementing Project Citizen. Their first recruits often are their friends who teach, or teachers they have met locally. This recruitment strategy is also used frequently in very sparsely populated states, where it is difficult to build relationships with teachers, principals, and curriculum directors who live long distances away.

The following examples illustrate how state coordinators who use a region-specific approach often depend on preexisting relationships or a small group of teachers to begin their outreach and recruitment for Project Citizen.

1. Alaska state coordinator Doug Phillips believes states that are just beginning Project Citizen implementation should focus on nurturing a few master teachers. Once a small core of teachers is developed, they will help raise awareness of the program throughout the state. Phillips views these teachers as integral in starting the "four stages of development": 1) awareness of Project Citizen, 2) teacher buy-in of Project Citizen, 3) participation in state and national Project Citizen competitions, and 4) Project Citizen adoption by local and state education leaders.[13]

2. In Montana, state coordinator Sally Broughton relies on word of mouth to spread the good news about Project Citizen. Given the large size of Montana, the cost of bringing students and teachers to a central area for competition has been an obstacle to expanding the use of

Project Citizen. Thus most of the teachers who use the program are friends of Broughton's or live in her immediate area.[14]

3. James Adomanis, Maryland's state coordinator, focuses on teachers in the Baltimore metropolitan area. He speaks at conferences, sends recruitment letters, places announcements in newspapers and magazines, and relies on word of mouth to spread information about Project Citizen.[15]

There are advantages to building a critical mass of classrooms using Project Citizen in one region. Teachers have easy access to other teachers who are using Project Citizen, which allows them to discuss classroom strategies, common challenges, and success stories. When teachers can be easily brought together for an orientation, training, or competition session, it is easier to build excitement about the program. Most important, focusing on a single region facilitates the development of relationships and the creation of networks—essential parts of recruitment and outreach. Indeed, the state coordinator in Ohio, where 30 teachers have used Project Citizen, and the coordinator in Kentucky, where 15 teachers have used Project Citizen, have found that one-on-one contact with teachers is the most important component to effective outreach.[16] A major disadvantage of the region-specific approach is the lack of state coverage; there may be many other teachers in the state who would like to use Project Citizen if they were aware of the program. Also, a region-specific approach may not generate the widespread political support necessary in a state to generate significant state funding.

A second recruitment approach is covering the entire state when eliciting support for Project Citizen. State coordinators who pursue this strategy believe it is important to encourage participation in all parts of the state. Some are emulating the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* model, in which every congressional district is targeted and an effort is made to recruit participating teachers in each district. Several states use this approach, as is illustrated below.

1. In Wisconsin, Project Citizen state coordinator Alfred Block disseminates information about the program through conferences, such as the Wisconsin Council for Social Studies annual meeting; recruitment letters; statewide newsletters; word of mouth; and direct contact by congressional district coordinators. For example, a recent mailing sent to 1,200 schools announcing the Council for Social Studies meeting included information about Project Citizen. He uses a database available through the Department of Public Instruction for mailings. His goal is to have at least one school in each congressional district participating in a Project Citizen state competition.[17]

2. Mark Freeman, the Texas state coordinator, uses blanket mailings, newsletters, and word of mouth to recruit teachers. Since he is an employee of the Law-Related Education Office at the State Bar of Texas, he also uses its conferences as opportunities to hold introductory and informational Project Citizen workshops, facilitated by a teacher who has used Project Citizen.[18]

3. California state coordinator Roy Erickson receives assistance from Project Citizen regional coordinators, an assistant state coordinator for Project Citizen, and CCE staff in conducting presentations to teachers and administrators at conferences such as the California League of

Middle Schools and the California Council for Social Studies. In the future, he plans to send mass mailings to middle school principals and contact school board associations and PTAs throughout the state.[19]

There are many challenges inherent in the statewide approach for state coordinators who lack adequate Project Citizen administrative staff support. Several state coordinators use the statewide approach because *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* does. But this program, unlike Project Citizen, has built awareness among educators and politicians and established a network of support over more than ten years. If Project Citizen state coordinators do not have strong support from colleagues or other coordinators, they often spread themselves too thin trying to implement a statewide approach. Such a diffuse effort works against relationship building, effective teacher recruitment and support, and organized coordination.

About one-third of the Project Citizen state coordinators have developed a recruitment approach that combines the statewide and region-specific approaches. These coordinators focus on building a network of support in one or more priority regions, while still committing program resources statewide. The regions selected may be counties, school districts, or areas surrounding major cities. This approach is labor intensive, but it can be very effective in states with adequate resources, as the following examples illustrate.

1. Florida state coordinator Annette Boyd Pitts is working with all school districts in Florida. Pitts conducted Project Citizen awareness sessions during the Florida Council for Social Studies Teachers Annual Conference and helped produce a civic education web site.[20] She developed an especially good relationship with Miami-Dade County Public Schools. The supervisor of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools' Office of Social Studies is directly involved in promoting Project Citizen and sponsored a day-long teacher training session in November 1997. That office is considering using Project Citizen as the basis for a district-wide seventh grade "civics bee."[21] Pitts also developed relationships with Hillsborough County, which sponsored Project Citizen training in February 1998. The county's social studies supervisor is considering promoting Project Citizen for use in middle school gifted and honors classes.[22]

2. Lon Weber, the Pennsylvania state coordinator, used a region-specific approach during Project Citizen's first year but then expanded recruitment efforts to the entire state. During the 1996-97 school year, Weber focused his outreach in the counties immediately surrounding Valley Forge. Success in that small area helped him recruit regional coordinators in other parts of the state and receive $31,380 in state funds. He has four Project Citizen regional coordinators who do direct outreach to teachers, and he works to develop relationships with state education department officials as well as with private schools and home school associations. Weber received authorization to send out a Project Citizen recruitment letter on PENN*LINK, a state-run listserv that reaches educators throughout Pennsylvania. He requested authorization to speak to the Intermediate Unit Coordinating Committee, a statewide body of curriculum and teacher training coordinators. His agency, the Freedoms Foundation, installed a toll-free number to make it easier to call for Project Citizen materials or general information. The regional coordinators speak at conferences, make recruiting phone calls to teachers and principals, and hold information sessions.[23]

3. Washington state coordinator Kathy Hand uses multiple outreach methods. Much of her recruiting is directed at her friends who are teachers in her immediate community. In addition, she is considering working with a local news TV station to highlight Project Citizen by using student portfolios as the story. Statewide, she marketed Project Citizen at numerous venues. She set up a booth at the statewide Curriculum and Instruction Conference, which is attended by book vendors. At the State School Directors conference, attended by school board members and superintendents, she had a booth where she gave away CCE books. She also sends out notifications about CCE programs on the Education Service District's mailing service.[24]

The hybrid approach is the ideal recruitment and outreach approach, resources permitting. This conclusion is based on the relatively high number of teachers using Project Citizen in most of the states using this approach. By focusing on a specific region, the necessary relationships can be established for institutionalizing the program. Yet statewide awareness of Project Citizen also is important for program visibility and support. The Pennsylvania model illustrates the importance of coupling the approaches. Its state coordinator's successful grant application to the state for Project Citizen support was funded because Project Citizen had been successfully implemented in a specific sub-state region, the program was viewed as a statewide program, and the state coordinator had built an effective relationship with state education department officials. Because this approach is labor intensive, it is often most successful in states where the state coordinator has strong organizational support.

Teacher Targeting Approaches

A common theme among Project Citizen state coordinators is that Project Citizen is most effectively marketed to "outgoing, flexible, innovative teachers" who "trust their kids," are comfortable with active learning, and enjoy their job. Moreover, these teachers are not inhibited by colleagues who question their willingness to make an extra effort to use Project Citizen in their classrooms.[25]

There is less agreement among state coordinators, however, about what approaches will most effectively reach the targeted teachers. Sixty-eight percent of state coordinators focus their recruitment and outreach efforts on social studies and government teachers, as shown in table 4.1. Some coordinators broaden the circle of potential teachers. In Washington, teachers are using Project Citizen in a learning disabled classroom and in a drug rehabilitation program.[26] In Texas and Alabama, teachers use the program in math classes.[27] In many states, including Pennsylvania and Arizona, Project Citizen is used in a language arts class.[28] In Ohio, the coordinator targets curriculum leaders in economics career education.[29] North Carolina markets Project Citizen as a violence reduction program.[30] Kentucky's state coordinator promotes Project Citizen as a crime prevention program.[31] In sum, although most state coordinators view Project Citizen as a program for social studies teachers, a significant number of them believe Project Citizen is a very flexible program that can complement many subject areas or be taught as its own class.

Table 4.1
Types of Teachers Targeted by Project Citizen State Coordinators

Types of Teachers Targeted for Project	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Social Studies/Government Teachers	23	68
Teachers Using Other CCE Programs	21	62
New Teachers	13	38
Experienced Teachers	12	35
Friends of State Coordinator	7	21
Other	11	32

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

Note: Percentages add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

Recruitment Approaches: Deciding How to Describe Project Citizen

Publicizing the Opinions and Successes of Project Citizen Teachers

Teachers pay attention to the background of the individual offering them a new educational program. They are much more likely to trust a fellow teacher who can caution them about potential difficulties and offer them tips on implementing the program than an endorsement by someone unknown to them.[33] Teacher use of Project Citizen can be contagious. In some cases, like at Cedarbrook Middle School in Pennsylvania, Project Citizen spread within a school because teachers see the excitement generated by the program among the students.

Perhaps the most appealing marketing message with which to reach potential Project Citizen teachers is that the program is an excellent teaching tool. Ninety-eight percent of teachers surveyed who are using Project Citizen report that it is a good way to teach civic education, and 83 percent said they would use it again.[34] This is an exceptionally strong endorsement by teachers who are very familiar with the program.

When teachers were asked why they would use Project Citizen again, their common responses were that Project Citizen

- *fosters knowledge of government,*
- *excites kids,*
- *is easy to follow,*
- *gets students involved,*
- *has concrete results and is project driven,*
- *involves everyone,*
- *goes beyond memorization,*
- *develops higher-order thinking skills,*
- *integrates disciplines and skills,*

- provides opportunity for application, and
- fosters teamwork and cooperation.[35]

Matching Project Citizen with State or District Education Standards

State education standards in the social studies greatly affect the recruitment and outreach strategies of Project Citizen state coordinators. Generally, the less specific the state standards, the less problematic they are for Project Citizen coordinators, because such standards provide creative teachers with the opportunity to incorporate Project Citizen into their instructional materials. Yet in some states with specific standards, Project Citizen also fits nicely. Coordinators have the most difficult time in states that are in the process of developing standards. In these states, teachers frequently do not want to adopt a program until they are sure it will fit into new, and as yet unknown, curriculum requirements.

The following examples show how state education standards are affecting Project Citizen state coordinators' educator recruitment and outreach approaches.

1. Florida has very specific state and district standards that Project Citizen complements. For example, these standards state that "[a]fter investigating contemporary community problems, the students, working in teams, will identify major local problems and perform a community service designed to address one problem. . . ."[36] The state coordinator highlights the correlation between Project Citizen and state standards during training sessions. Additionally, the Florida Department of Education recently established new requirements that mandate teaching about Florida government. The coordinator believes this will lead to increased interest in Project Citizen.[37]

2. Hawaii is in the process of significant education reform. For example, it is finalizing state standards, developing curriculum frameworks that support the standards, and developing an accountability and assessment system that links to the standards. This transition period makes it difficult for teachers to commit to use Project Citizen. Nevertheless, the Project Citizen state coordinator believes that once the social studies standards are finalized, they will match closely with the Project Citizen curriculum. The coordinator plans to use this correlation when recruiting teachers.[38]

3. Existing state and district curriculum standards have created problems for recruiting Project Citizen teachers in New York. The standards include an extensive list of mandated areas that must be included in the middle school curriculum, and social studies testing occurs at the end of each school year. Several teachers commented that Project Citizen is a wonderful concept, but that they simply do not have the time to commit to it due to these state and district requirements.[39]

4. Indiana has very broad government and citizenship requirements, which Project Citizen easily fulfills. Teachers in one district mentioned that their district increased its emphasis on literacy and writing across the curriculum and that they see Project Citizen as a good way to address these priorities. Furthermore, middle school teachers in that district form teams that have specific instructional goals, some of which Project Citizen meets. For example, there is an interdisciplinary goal for the team to help students become more responsible citizens.[40]

In short, to encourage increased use of Project Citizen, state coordinators must show teachers that Project Citizen fits with established state and district education standards—and this is the case in several states. In a January 1998 project survey, 60 percent of teachers using Project Citizen reported that the program meets state curricular requirements.[41] Even more optimistically, 88 percent of state coordinators reported that Project Citizen helps teachers meet curriculum requirements.[42] Emphasizing this correlation is a strong and effective recruitment approach for state coordinators as well as for teachers, principals, curriculum directors, and other administrators. Indeed, when state coordinators were asked the extent to which they use Project Citizen's correlation with state curriculum requirements to encourage teachers to use Project Citizen, their average response was 3.3 (where 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, and 4=considerably).[43]

An effective approach to enhance the use of Project Citizen in a state is to develop a correlational matrix that shows exactly which state standards Project Citizen meets and how it meets them. The Washington state coordinator sent that state's standards to CCE, which prepared such a correlation guide. Many other state coordinators reported that they would like to prepare a similar correlation guide if they had the time.

Fitting Project Citizen into State Curriculum Frameworks

Teachers contemplating using Project Citizen want to know how the program fits within the existing state curriculum framework. Some are concerned that they would not have time for this process-oriented program and still be able to cover other mandated elements of their curriculum. This may not be as significant a problem as they fear. Although state coordinators rated the challenge presented by the time required in class as 3.2 (where 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, and 4=considerably),[44] teachers using Project Citizen rated the challenge presented by the time required in class as only 2.6 using the same scale.[45] The higher rating by state coordinators may be a reflection of the initial response of teachers ("it looks time consuming"), whereas the lower rating by teachers may reflect what teachers think after they have used Project Citizen ("it actually does not have to be time consuming"). Thus state coordinators need to reassure potential Project Citizen teachers that the program is not as time consuming as it may initially appear.

Teaching Project Citizen as Stand-Alone Program or Supplement to an Existing Curriculum

State coordinators have differing views on whether Project Citizen should be promoted as a stand-alone program, a program that supplements an existing curriculum, or a program flexible enough to be either. Because some coordinators have only seen the program taught as a supplement to an existing curriculum, they cannot "see how it would work" as a stand-alone, semester-long class.[46] In states like North Carolina, on the other hand, the program has been promoted and implemented successfully as a stand-alone program.[47] Coordinators in these latter states encourage innovative teachers to find ways to structure Project Citizen so students are able to work on their project all semester.

Promoting the Project Citizen Competition

Competition is an important part of Project Citizen and helps raise awareness about the program. Yet it sometimes presents challenges in recruiting teachers to use Project Citizen, because teachers may strongly support or oppose student competitions.

Project Citizen state coordinators place varying emphasis on the competition when they describe the program. Coordinators also have varying degrees of sensitivity to the fact that some teachers, principals, and curriculum directors may like student competitions, while others may dislike them. Some stress the importance of the competition; others stress the importance of the process of developing and presenting a portfolio. Coordinators who take the former approach are likely to present the final event as a competition in which students also celebrate their achievements. Coordinators who use the latter approach may present the final event as a celebration of the students' achievements, where the competition is secondary. Some state coordinators emphasize the competition by requiring each Project Citizen teacher to sign a contract stating that his or her students will submit a portfolio in the state competition in order to receive the free set of Project Citizen books for the class. On the other hand, in Alabama, for example, the state coordinator found that for most Project Citizen classes, the presentation of their public policy problem and proposed solution at a town council meeting is more important than winning any competition among classes.

The competition attracts some teachers to Project Citizen and causes others to reject it. Some teachers are anti-competition for fear they might win and have to commit the extra time and effort attending and preparing for further competitions.[48] One teacher said that she did not realize the final event was a competition rather than a celebration. Although her class placed third in the state, she will not teach Project Citizen again because she does not like competitions.[49] However, another teacher noted that when her class won third place in the national competition, other teachers took note and started using Project Citizen.[50] These examples suggest that, for some state coordinators, not emphasizing the competition to teachers may be an effective approach, while other state coordinators may find that the existence of competitions enhances the attractiveness of Project Citizen.

Outreach Strategies

Project Citizen state coordinators use various approaches to inform and build support among teachers. Table 4.2 provides a summary of these methods. Table 4.3 illustrates that CCE also plays an important role in raising awareness about Project Citizen; 46 percent of teachers using the program first learned about it from CCE, whereas 33 percent learned of it from their respective state coordinators and 21 percent from other teachers.

Table 4.2
State Coordinator Outreach Strategies to Teachers

How State Coordinators Inform Teachers about Project Citizen	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Conferences	30	88
Recruitment Letters	29	85
Word of Mouth	26	76
Newsletters and Magazines	18	53
Other	14	41

Source: LBJ Survey of State Coordinators, December 1997.

Note: Percentages add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

Table 4.3
How Teachers First Learn About Project Citizen

Information Sources	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers
Through Center for Civic Education	22	46
Through Project Citizen State Coordinator	15	31
Through Another Teacher	10	21
Through Other Means	9	19

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Note: Percentages add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

Distributing Free Materials

CCE provides ten free sets of Project Citizen books to each Project Citizen state coordinator annually (and more upon request); they are available in Spanish and English. State coordinators often use these free materials to encourage teachers to use the program and to increase the visibility of the program. A few coordinators require the teachers to sign a contract stating they will participate in the Project Citizen competition in return for receiving the materials; however, at least one state coordinator has stopped this practice, finding it ineffective. Some coordinators offer the materials to teachers with minimal conditions to evaluate the likelihood they will be used. In such cases, there is often no follow-up to see if Project Citizen was taught. Most coordinators try to save the materials for teachers who seem serious about Project Citizen. Distributing the books has played an important role in raising awareness about the program and spreading its use.

Using Mass Mailings, Newsletters, Web Sites, and Listservs

Coordinators have developed some outreach approaches that do not require a significant time commitment. Such methods include using teacher or educational administrator listservs; mass mailings to teachers, principals, and curriculum directors; newsletters; educational book fairs; Project Citizen orientations; and presentations at conferences, in-service training sessions, CCE events, and home school association meetings. Some coordinators bring an actual Project Citizen student portfolio or pictures of portfolios to these events; however, since the program is still relatively new, portfolios often are not available.

Several state coordinators have developed web sites that promote Project Citizen. For example, in a collaborative effort with the Minnesota Center for Community Legal Education, the Minnesota state coordinator has developed a web page at http://www.ccle.fourh.umn.edu.[51] The Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., which is directed by the Florida state coordinator, uses its civic education web site at http://www.pubadm.fsu.edu/civiced as a Project Citizen awareness tool.[52] The Texas state coordinator is planning to develop a web page.[53]

Developing Incentives

Florida's state coordinator developed an incentive-based outreach method to encourage participation. Because a teacher's inability or hesitancy to get out of class to attend Project Citizen orientation or training sessions is a barrier to effective outreach, the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc. developed several incentives to overcome this barrier. It reimburses school districts for teacher substitute pay when teachers attend Project Citizen training programs. It also reimburses teachers 27 cents per mile for driving to the training. Furthermore, it provides coffee and muffins or lunch at training sessions, as well as an order form for a free set of Project Citizen classroom materials.[54]

Building Relationships with Teachers, Principals, and Curriculum Directors

Successful recruitment and outreach fundamentally requires building relationships with teachers, principals, curriculum directors, and others.[55] State coordinators build these relationships through school visits, discussions at conferences, telephone calls, and informal discussions among peers. This one-on-one contact makes educators comfortable they will have someone to call if they have difficulties with Project Citizen. In addition, these relationships promote continued use of Project Citizen in a school or district over the long term. They are key to building the sustainable network required for broad implementation of Project Citizen.

Recommendations

Project Citizen is expanding in many states because of the innovation and hard work many state coordinators have applied to their marketing and outreach activities. Project Citizen state coordinators who are effective at marketing and outreach are dedicated and actively seek opportunities to build relationships with teachers and administrators. They also view Project Citizen as a versatile program appropriate for any teacher and almost every classroom. Rather than letting limited financial resources restrict their efforts to gain support of teachers and administrators, they work with what they have while searching for more. They view implementation as a process that requires raising awareness of the program; building a network of support among teachers, principals, curriculum directors, and social studies supervisors; and recruiting volunteers to assist them with marketing and outreach.

Following are the recommendations to improve CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators' effectiveness in recruiting and building support among teachers and administrators.

1. *CCE, in collaboration with Project Citizen state coordinators, should develop and maintain an updated and shared database of Project Citizen teachers that could be used to recruit and build support among teachers and school administrators.* CCE currently maintains a list of individuals (many of them teachers, but not all) who have requested and received Project Citizen texts; however, CCE does not know which of these individuals have used Project Citizen in the classroom. State coordinators, on the other hand, know most of the teachers using Project Citizen in their respective states, but the possibility exists that a teacher using Project Citizen received the material from a friend or CCE, and knows nothing about the Project Citizen state coordinator. Even when CCE or coordinators know who is using Project Citizen, basic information about the classroom setting (e.g., congressional district, grade level, type of class, topic of portfolio, number of students) often is not known. CCE should work with coordinators to identify key data elements to collect and maintain and to determine a process by which to obtain the data; an integrated data and communication network that connects CCE and all state coordinators is crucial to this project. This database, although its creation would be a challenge, would be very useful for identifying and involving Project Citizen teachers in state recruitment and outreach initiatives.

2. *Project Citizen state coordinator strategies and plans for recruiting and building support among teachers and school administrators should emphasize the program's vision and content more than the process of carrying out recruitment and outreach, as well as be consistent with CCE's conception of the program.* Recruitment and outreach should be more than a public relations campaign; it should focus on informing teachers, principals, curriculum supervisors, and other school administrators about Project Citizen's objectives and outcomes. For such recruitment and outreach to be effective, state coordinators must fully understand and share CCE's long-term vision for Project Citizen, its expectations for program outcomes and coordinator responsibilities, and its view of what constitutes successful implementation. For example, if coordinators and CCE disagree on how flexible teachers can be in following the Project Citizen curriculum or on whether competitions and simulated hearings are essential parts of the program, then coordinators will be unable to carry out effectively their recruitment and outreach responsibilities.

3. *CCE should ensure that all Project Citizen state coordinators are able and willing to recruit and build support among teachers and school administrators.* Experience is a critical factor in this regard, and there are wide variations among coordinators' capabilities. CCE should explore alternative ways through which it could help the less-experienced state coordinators improve their recruitment and outreach skills, including offering coordinators a video or booklet with examples of successful and unsuccessful state strategies and practices; arranging for experienced and effective state coordinators to provide technical assistance to

others; promoting one-hour regional teleconferences or conference calls among state coordinators during which time they could discuss recruitment and outreach successes and problems; and focusing regional or national meetings of coordinators on this issue.

4. *Each Project Citizen state coordinator should develop and update annually the portions of his or her state's Project Citizen implementation plan that address recruitment and outreach.* The state's Project Citizen Advisory Committee should assist the coordinator in this task, as well as in carrying out the recruitment and outreach activities. In particular, this plan should clearly identify the vertical and horizontal strategies underlying these activities, namely, whether the coordinator is using a bottom-up approach or a top-down approach (or a combination) and whether the coordinator is using a statewide approach or a region-specific approach (or a combination). Coordinators' recruitment and outreach strategies should be clear about the types of teachers and classes being targeted in their respective state implementation plans, and this requires that coordinators first have a broad understanding of the subject matter and academic ability level of Project Citizen classes. For example, coordinators need to be aware that Project Citizen can be used in English, environmental science, and mathematics classes as well as in government and history classes, and in English as a second language classes as well as in gifted and talented classes. Coordinators also need to be aware that Project Citizen can be taught over an entire semester or during an intensive four-week module, and that it can be taught as a curricular offering, an extracurricular activity, or a combination of the two.

5. *CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators should work together to develop a spectrum of techniques and resources to recruit and build support among teachers and school administrators.* One important action would be for CCE and coordinators to develop, for each state, a correlation matrix that documents the links between Project Citizen elements and state and district curriculum standards and assessments. Teachers and school administrators who are aware of this correlation are often more likely to use Project Citizen. Coordinators also should make wide use of Project Citizen success stories, preferably (but not solely) from their own states; work with CCE and teachers to develop a video that would demonstrate what is actually involved in using Project Citizen; and, with CCE's counsel, provide teachers suggestions about alternative ways in which they might design their Project Citizen lesson plans. Teacher and coordinator concerns about the time necessary to use Project Citizen often are alleviated when teachers and principals understand the Project Citizen program more fully.

6. *Project Citizen state coordinators should give additional attention to informing principals, curriculum directors, and school board members about Project Citizen and gaining their support.* Coordinators often focus their efforts to build support on teachers (who will use Project Citizen in the classroom and community) or on legislators and other external groups (who are potential sources of funding for the program). Principals and other school officials often become the "forgotten middle." Our research shows that teachers who participate in Project Citizen one year may not do so the next; some are reassigned to a different school or to teach different classes, and some fail to receive the moral and perhaps financial support they need from their school administrators. School administrators who understand the value of Project Citizen for students and communities are critically important to institutionalize

Project Citizen in a school or school district. A coordinator's advisory committee can provide valuable assistance in fostering school administrator advocacy, as can an administrator's understanding of the links between Project Citizen and state and district standards.

7. *To the extent resources permit, CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators should work together to identify ways to expand the number of free or discounted Project Citizen student and teacher texts made available by CCE to states.* Some state coordinators stop recruiting Project Citizen teachers when they have given away the ten free sets each currently receives from CCE. Also, providing Project Citizen materials at this early stage of implementation is critical to increase awareness of the program and to build up a critical mass of enthusiastic and dedicated teachers who are using Project Citizen successfully. One approach could be for CCE to implement a materials distribution formula that both provides a base allocation of free classroom material sets to each state and provides additional free sets to a state based on the number of its congressional districts. Supplemental free sets of Project Citizen materials also might be given to state coordinators as incentives for recruiting substantially greater numbers of participating Project Citizen teachers.

Notes

[1] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[2] Telephone interviews (conference call) by Brandon Atkinson with Chuck Canning, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 2, Pennsylvania; Jennie-Lynn Knox, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 4, Pennsylvania; and Dave Morris, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 3, Pennsylvania, February 26, 1998.

[3] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Joan Murphy, Associate Director of Educational Programs, Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., and Assistant to Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tampa, Florida, November 20, 1997.

[4] Canning et al. interviews.

[5] Telephone interview by Brandi Stewart with Judy Simpson, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Sparks, Nevada, October 8, 1997.

[6] Telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Mark Freeman, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Austin, Texas, October 9, 1997.

[7] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Lon Weber, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, February 12, 1998.

[8] Simpson interview.

[9] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Kathy Hand, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Seattle, Washington, February 26, 1998.

[10] Interview by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with Gayle Kernick, Project Citizen Assistant State Coordinator, Sacramento, California, February 10, 1998; and interviews by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with members of the California Project Citizen Advisory Committee, Sacramento, California, February 10, 1998.

[11] Canning et al. interviews.

[12] Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., "Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop Evaluation Forms," Miami and Tampa, Fla., November 19-20, 1997.

[13] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Doug Phillips, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Anchorage,

Alaska, February 11, 1998.

[14] Telephone interview by Pete Weber with Sally Broughton, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Bozeman, Montana, October 6, 1997.

[15] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[16] Interview by Rachel Feit with Libby Cupp, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Lima, Ohio, January 29, 1998; and telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Tracey Sharpe, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Middlesboro, Kentucky, October 9, 1997.

[17] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Alfred Block, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Franklin, Wisconsin, February 27, 1998.

[18] Freeman interview.

[19] Kernick interview.

[20] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[21] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Charles Murray, District Social Studies Supervisor, Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida, November 19, 1997.

[22] Murphy interview, April 1, 1998.

[23] Canning et al. interviews; Weber interview.

[24] Hand interview.

[25] Canning et al. interviews; Weber interview; and Phillips interview.

[26] Hand interview.

[27] Freeman interview; and interview by Anne Ray with Wade Black, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Birmingham, Alabama, February 18, 1998.

[28] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Jean Bockenhauer and Robert Allekotte, Project Citizen Teachers, Amy at Martin School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 26, 1998; and interview by Writer Mott with Julie McCall, Project Citizen Teacher, Madison #1 Middle School, Phoenix, Arizona, December 3, 1997.

[29] Cupp interview.

[30] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina, January 14, 1998.

[31] Center for Civic Education, "News from the States," *Center Correspondent*, vol. 10, no. 1 (Fall 1997), p. 8.

[32] Canning et al. interviews; and interview by Writer Mott and Peter Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[33] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Christine Neimond, Project Citizen Teacher, and Jerry Katz, Social Studies Curriculum Director, Cedarbrook Middle School, Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, February 25, 1998.

[34] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Miami-Dade County Public Schools, "Social Studies" (Handout distributed by Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., at Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop, Miami, Florida, November 19, 1997), p. 1.

[37] Murphy interview, February 10, 1998.

[38] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Sharon Kaohi, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 11, 1998.

[39] Telephone interview by Rachel Feit with Stephen Schechter, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Troy, New York, October 1, 1997.

[40] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Pam Luenz, former Project Citizen Teacher, and Dee Motz, Project Citizen Teacher, Sunnyside Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[41] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[42] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Canning et al. interviews.

[47] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Judith Dempsey, Guidance Counselor, Central Elementary School, Maple, North Carolina, February 5, 1998.

[48] Canning et al. interviews.

[49] Bockenhauer and Allekotte interview.

[50] Neimond and Katz interview.

[51] Interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Roger Wangen, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Minneapolis, Minnesota, January 8, 1998.

[52] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[53] Freeman interview.

[54] Murphy interview, November 20, 1997.

[55] Cupp interview; Phillips interview; and Hand interview.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

Alabama Students Succeed—New Traffic Light Installed!

A new traffic light was installed at a dangerous intersection as a result of hard work by students in Shelly Chumley and Diane Kendricks' class at Bryan Elementary School in Morris, Alabama. After the students identified the need for the light at an intersection near their school, the students conducted research which included taking photos of the scene and surveying 700 local citizens about the issue. "I liked the surveying and calling and asking questions," wrote one of the students. The class tallied the results of their survey, and designed charts and graphs to display their findings. Armed with their research and portfolio, the students presented their proposal to about 16 local community leaders. After their presentation, the students made follow-up phone calls to the police chief and Alabama Department of Transportation until they achieved their goal. "It was fun to work with others in my group and my community and it was neat to learn so much information about my community's system and about government," reported a Bryan Elementary School student. The best part of Project Citizen is that "you can make your community a better place," concluded another student.[1]

---

[1] Interview by Anne Ray with Shelly Chumley, Project Citizen Teacher, Morris, Alabama, February 19, 1998; and Bill Platt, "Students Ask Council for Red Light," *Birmingham News* (February 25, 1998), pp. 1BC, 5BC.

Chapter 5. Teacher Training

Training teachers how to effectively integrate the Project Citizen program into classrooms and curricula is essential to the program's successful implementation. However, no single, comprehensive training strategy exists to instruct teachers how to use Project Citizen, nor are there guidelines for state coordinators who organize and conduct Project Citizen training sessions. As a result, teachers across the country do not receive the same level or type of instruction on how to use the program in their classrooms. Many teachers report that they are self-taught, while others feel ill-prepared to implement the program in their classes.

This chapter describes the different teacher training strategies currently used by CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators and examines the barriers that prevent state coordinators from adequately preparing teachers to use Project Citizen. This chapter concludes with recommendations for how CCE and state coordinators can improve teacher training.

Number of Teachers Trained

Project Citizen state coordinators report that since the 1995-96 school year, 34 states held teacher training sessions and a total of 1,230 teachers were trained to implement Project Citizen in the classroom.[1] There is no single, comprehensive training strategy used to train teachers, however. Training sessions vary in scope and are usually administered by a Project Citizen state coordinator or regional coordinator, CCE staff, or a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinator. In a few cases, state coordinators recruit teachers experienced in using Project Citizen as teacher trainers.

Not all teachers who use Project Citizen receive training, though. Among the teachers using Project Citizen who responded to our survey, only 38 percent had received Project Citizen training.[2] California teacher Anita Bruvold was one of several teachers who reported they did not receive training because they were unaware that it was available. She used Project Citizen with one of her classes anyway but admitted that it had been "difficult to organize the program."[3] Although she was able to use the program successfully one year, she was unable to finish Project Citizen another year because it was above her students' ability and "very time consuming to figure out."[4]

Our research suggests that the lack of training or inadequate training in the use of Project Citizen may contribute to a teacher's decision not to use the program. Among the teachers requesting and receiving Project Citizen materials from CCE or state coordinators who responded to our survey but who opted not to use the program, only 27 percent were trained to implement Project Citizen in the classroom.[5] Twenty-nine percent of the respondents (some of whom had received training and some of whom had not) cited inadequate training as a considerable barrier to their using the program.[6]

Types of Teacher Training

Project Citizen teacher training sessions vary substantially in length and substance, from one-hour information sessions to a full day of hands-on training.

When asked to describe the nature of their teacher training sessions, Project Citizen state coordinators reported the following: 69 percent of the respondents indicated that their sessions were information sessions about CCE and Project Citizen, 80 percent reported that they involved a "review" or "walk through" of Project Citizen materials, 66 percent indicated that they were "how to" sessions for teaching Project Citizen, and 9 percent indicated that these sessions served as forums for gaining the support of the school, community, and principal.[7]

The following section examines the differences between Project Citizen training sessions that are essentially information sessions and those that provide "how to" training, after which there is a brief discussion of post-session teacher follow-up.

Information Sessions vs. "How To" Training Sessions

There are important differences between teacher information sessions that create *awareness* of Project Citizen and "how to" sessions that provide *hands-on* training. Personal interviews with state coordinators and our observations of Project Citizen workshops reveal that information sessions often consist of an overview of CCE programs and a preview of Project Citizen materials. For example, the facilitator may discuss the six steps involved in implementing Project Citizen as outlined in the student guide.[8] Sometimes the presenter will cite the experiences of other classes and showcase samples of student portfolios. Topics addressed during an information session vary depending on the trainer's experience with Project Citizen and the time available.

Our research on these information sessions may be incomplete, however, since some Project Citizen coordinators do not consider such sessions comprehensive enough to be called (or reported as) training sessions. California regional coordinator Pat Hitchcock acknowledges that although in her Project Citizen workshops she discusses the program with teachers for about an hour, these workshops do not provide hands-on training.[9] Also, some teachers contend that short information and awareness sessions are often not enough to prepare them to use Project Citizen. For example, Rosaleen Zisch, a teacher in San Jose, California, says that training should last longer than an hour and a half.[10] On the other hand, many teachers using Project Citizen reported that their initial exposure to Project Citizen was in an information session. Thus while information sessions may not provide the complete training that many teachers would like, they do serve a useful purpose by creating teacher interest in the program and stimulating some participants to use Project Citizen.

Comprehensive training sessions, on the other hand, usually range from three hours to a full day and provide more opportunities for teachers to see and experience the components of the program. The trainer not only provides an overview of Project Citizen, but also showcases samples of student portfolios and provides anecdotes of student projects. Sometimes participants are given Project Citizen materials to take back to their classes. In some of the more extensive training sessions, teachers work together to create a portfolio during the session. This requires the trainer to take the teachers through each of the six steps outlined in the Project Citizen student and teacher guide. Furthermore, teachers may be given the opportunity to discuss with other teachers different approaches to using the program with their respective students. These types of sessions stimulate dialogue and networking among teachers to a much greater degree than the information sessions.

Teacher Follow-Up

Some Project Citizen state coordinators, including those in Alabama, Hawaii, and Ohio, provide additional assistance to teachers after the initial training sessions. Upon request, Alabama state coordinator Wade Black provides extra workshops, site visits, and phone walk-through sessions to assist teachers throughout the school year. During one teacher workshop in Alabama, a teacher noted that such "follow-up, follow-through and tracking are critical."[11] Sharon Kaohi, the Hawaii state coordinator, contacts teachers through letters, e-mail, and phone calls to offer technical assistance after training sessions.[12]

During the 1996-97 school year, the Colorado state coordinator, Barbara Miller, organized monthly workshops for teachers, using these opportunities to discuss concerns that developed while implementing Project Citizen. Miller believes that, in order to implement Project Citizen well, it is necessary to have continual contact with teachers while they are using the program.[13] Idaho state coordinator Dan Prinzing, a teacher himself, also maintains regular contact with teachers during their use of Project Citizen and is able to field specific teacher-related questions.[14] These state coordinator activities, however, are often contingent on the availability of funds and time. For example, Miller was unable to continue her monthly workshops during the 1997-98 school year after her funding for the program ended.

Training Methods in Selected States

Various teacher training methods are used to prepare teachers to use Project Citizen in the classroom. The following teacher training approaches used by state coordinators and other teacher trainers highlight several different Project Citizen teacher training strategies.

Conference Presentations

Many state coordinators use conferences as an opportunity to provide teachers with basic Project Citizen information and, in some cases, formal training. Project Citizen training sessions are commonly held during social studies, law-related education, and middle school conferences (e.g., Hawaii Association of Middle Schools Conference) or in conjunction with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* events. Thus, as in Minnesota, for example, Project Citizen training is often featured with other civic education information and training programs. Conference attendees then can choose to attend Project Citizen presentations rather than other conference workshops.

There are advantages to using conferences as a means to introduce the Project Citizen program to teachers. Statewide conferences cater to a broad audience of teachers, and thus the trainer can reach a diverse audience without having to travel around the state or mail out invitations to teachers. Furthermore, in some cases trainers do not have to worry about paying for the space used. In short, the trainer is likely to spend less time and resources on logistics than if he or she were to organize separate training programs.

There are limitations to this approach, however. For example, since Project Citizen workshops during conferences may be just one of many activities taking place, trainers must compete with other workshops for an audience. Furthermore, most conference workshops are relatively short and thus lessen opportunities for comprehensive training. As a result, conference formats may lend themselves more to information sessions than to "how to" sessions.

Simulated Project Citizen Activities

Training sessions involving the simulation of Project Citizen activities are well-liked by teachers. In November 1997, in partnership with CCE, Annette Boyd Pitts, the Florida state coordinator, held Project Citizen training sessions in two Florida cities. One of these sessions also was sponsored by the Miami-Dade County Public Schools. The sessions were full-day, comprehensive in-service training programs conducted by Michael Fischer of CCE. The training included lectures on and discussions about the instructional process and the components of the Project Citizen program, as well as a portfolio development activity in which teachers simulated the Project Citizen curriculum and presented their work portfolios in the same manner that their students would. The portfolio development activity required teachers to go through each step of the Project Citizen curriculum. This enabled the teachers to work with each other and share ideas about possible implementation strategies. When asked to evaluate the workshop at the end of the day, teachers responded positively to the simulated activities and expressed their appreciation for the hands-on experience.[15]

As a result of participating in one of these sessions, a representative from the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., who assists Pitts with the administration of Project Citizen, received her qualification to become a teacher trainer. Subsequently, she conducted a three-hour in-service Project Citizen teacher training session in Florida's Hillsborough County in February 1998.

Similarly, Tom Middleton, a California teacher trainer for the San Diego region, engages teachers in simulated Project Citizen activities, although on a reduced scale due to time constraints (six hours). During his sessions, teachers break into small groups (two to four teachers per group) and later report back to the entire group based on their discussions of different sections of Project Citizen. The trainer then takes a particular lesson and walks the teachers through it, just as they would do with their own students. According to Middleton, this gives the teachers an idea of what the lessons are like. Middleton suggests that any time a trainer can show process in action, the training becomes more realistic to the teachers involved, because they begin to understand what the students may feel and think.[16] Thus Middleton concentrates on providing teachers a *method* of using Project Citizen.

Teachers seem to appreciate the opportunity to actually work on Project Citizen activities in training sessions. These types of training sessions often require more time and resources than other types, however, with CCE's comprehensive training sessions lasting a full day and scaled-down versions of these sessions ranging from three to six hours.

Teachers as Teacher Trainers

Training sessions conducted by teachers with experience in using Project Citizen are often cited as very effective. A teacher herself, Minnesota Project Citizen teacher trainer Gail Huschle is able to use her personal experiences with the program to train others. Huschle's experience enables her to provide very clear instructions about how to use the materials and to point out where she has run into difficulties or where directions in the Project Citizen materials may be unclear.[17]

In Arizona, training sessions are conducted by Janet Thor, a teacher who has experience in using Project Citizen. Although Thor received no formal Project Citizen training herself, she has been conducting all the Project Citizen training in Arizona. In her sessions, Thor displays a portfolio prepared by her students and gives a detailed presentation about how to teach the program.[18] Arizona state coordinator Lynda Rando believes it is essential to have a teacher run the training, because this puts other teachers at ease; such trainers also can better answer teachers' questions, because they have had classroom experience.[19]

Teacher Rob Sauer, an Idaho district coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen trainer, draws on his own personal experiences as a teacher using the program as a guide for the teacher training he conducts.[20] Pat Hitchcock, a California regional coordinator for Project Citizen, emphasizes the importance of having teachers who are experienced in using Project Citizen participate in training presentations. As Hitchcock notes, teachers have different teaching styles and use Project Citizen materials in different ways. Thus it is important for teachers to become familiar with a variety of Project Citizen teaching approaches and teaching settings. Hitchcock cites how, during one training session, a teacher explained his use of a fifth grade reading level Project Citizen workbook with Limited English Proficiency students.[21]

Alternative Classroom and Conference Approaches

Similar to other coordinators, the Texas state coordinator holds Project Citizen teacher training workshops as part of an annual conference on law-related education initiatives. In spring 1998, for example, Texas teachers Norm Goldberg and Helen Pickle, both of whom use Project Citizen, and two middle school students from Goldberg's class led a 90-minute teacher training session before a group of law-related education teachers. The session outlined the six-step process to using Project Citizen in class. Goldberg demonstrated how teachers can help students identify a problem in their community and reflect on their learning experiences. The middle school students presented a portfolio they helped create and spoke about their Project Citizen experience. They discussed how they had identified a problem in their community and gathered information, the challenges they faced in working with city officials, and the lessons they had learned. They also showed elements of their portfolio to the audience, including letters from a San Antonio city councilman and the city's director of public works.

During this same session, Pickle presented alternative approaches to using Project Citizen. Pickle discussed with teachers how Project Citizen is not limited to use in a social studies curriculum. She outlined her plans to incorporate Project Citizen into a technology- and science-based curriculum. Pickle, a social studies teacher, described how she teams with a science

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teacher in her school to get their classes to use the Project Citizen program to work on environmental issues. These classes will engage in a distance learning program with schools around the country and use advanced technology to survey students and Washington, D.C., policy officials about environmental problems. Pickle also is soliciting the involvement of a mathematics teacher to help students create charts and graphs and tabulate survey data as part of their Project Citizen portfolio.

Key Elements in Teacher Training

As the previous section shows, there is no single best approach to conducting Project Citizen teacher training sessions. Furthermore, given the newness of the program, it is too early to determine which training strategy is the most effective. However, teachers indicate that they may be better served if Project Citizen training sessions include certain key elements. In particular, teachers are likely to gain the greatest benefit from a step-by-step review of the Project Citizen curriculum, the use of visual examples to demonstrate previous portfolio projects, an exposure to alternative methods of integrating Project Citizen into classrooms and curricula, and, where appropriate, hands-on opportunities.

A Minnesota Project Citizen teacher and trainer, Gail Huschle, believes that an actual run-through of the project provides the best training. Teachers are interested not only in knowing the successes of the program but also how to overcome challenges that may arise in class. For example, teacher Rosaleen Zisch suggests that she would benefit from guidance on how to narrow a public policy issue so that it can be handled by eighth grade students. Oklahoma teacher Jim Dailey would like to be exposed to different ways of accomplishing the main parts of the Project Citizen curriculum. Ohio teacher Vicki Keck states that she would like to see "more examples of completed [student] boards" (i.e., portfolios). Similarly, New Mexico teachers Judy Hedgecock and Connie Hudgeons suggest that they would like to examine samples of actual portfolios.[22]

Teachers using or exploring the use of Project Citizen are interested in knowing the strategies that other educators use with different types of students (e.g., how to adapt the Project Citizen curriculum to students with low reading levels and low achievement levels). Ensuring that Project Citizen meets diverse student needs is a particular area of concern for teachers who work in under-resourced schools. As one Florida teacher noted in her evaluation of a training session, "I am less concerned about the tremendous success of groups elsewhere and more concerned with the real world as it relates to me and my kids.... In [an] impoverished inner-city school, in other words, how can it work effectively with my kids?"[23]

Barriers to Effective Teacher Training

CCE, Project Citizen state coordinators, and Project Citizen teacher trainers all are committed to preparing teachers to use Project Citizen and are achieving impressive results. Despite these accomplishments, however, many barriers that inhibit effective teacher training persist. This section examines some of these barriers and how they might be overcome.

Insufficient Training for State Coordinators

One of the greatest barriers to effective Project Citizen teacher training is that Project Citizen state coordinators themselves have not had sufficient training on how to use Project Citizen in the classroom. Indeed, our research shows that no state coordinator has received formal training on training teachers how to use Project Citizen materials.[24] Although this has not prevented coordinators from implementing the program in their respective states, they generally agree that they would have benefited from more hands-on training and better guidance from CCE on how to conduct teacher training sessions.

Many Project Citizen state coordinators received a brief orientation to Project Citizen at the June 1997 national CCE conference for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinators in Washington, D.C., but several coordinators reported that this discussion was insufficient. For example, Mississippi state coordinator Lynette McBrayer said that while the session provided useful general information about Project Citizen, it failed to explain how Project Citizen could be used in the classroom.[25] Consequently, some state coordinators still do not feel comfortable conducting Project Citizen training on their own and often recruit others, particularly educators, to assist them.[26] For example, Alabama state coordinator Wade Black hires teachers who use Project Citizen in the classroom as trainers.

When asked to rate the responsiveness of CCE with respect to providing teacher training, Project Citizen state coordinators gave CCE a rating of 2.7 (where 1=poor, 2=adequate, 3=good, and 4=excellent) (see table 3.3). Moreover, when asked to rank five program areas relative to how important CCE support is to the success of Project Citizen in their states, seven of the 34 state coordinators who responded to our survey ranked the provision of teacher training as second in importance and eight ranked it third in importance.[27] Thus the view of state coordinators generally is that, while teacher training is not the most important area in which CCE could provide assistance to them, it is an area in which they would welcome more guidance and assistance from CCE on how to conduct a Project Citizen training session. Lynda Rando from Arizona was one of several state coordinators who suggested that CCE should offer stronger training not only to Project Citizen teachers but also to Project Citizen state coordinators.[28]

Project Citizen coordinators who have an education background usually are most comfortable conducting teacher training sessions, even if they have received no teacher training. For example, California regional coordinators Jack Gaffney and Pat Hitchcock, both of whom have extensive teaching experience, draw on this background when teaching others how to use Project Citizen. Still other state coordinators believe their experience with other CCE programs is sufficient to prepare them for presenting Project Citizen to teachers.

Insufficient Financial Resources

State coordinators cite a lack of financial resources as a major obstacle to conducting Project Citizen teacher training sessions. Without sufficient funds, trainers are limited from holding training sessions throughout different regions of their state and from sponsoring multiple training sessions throughout the school year. New Mexico Project Citizen state coordinator Dora Marroquin believes that training is very important to the success of the program and acknowledges that she needs additional resources to provide ample training opportunities.[29]

Furthermore, the need to fund a substitute teacher while a teacher attends training during class time, as well as to cover teachers' travel expenses, prohibits many teachers from participating in training sessions.[30] Although a few state coordinators (e.g., Florida) have covered such expenses, most are unable to provide teachers or schools with funds to cover them. As Libby Cupp, the Ohio state coordinator, notes, she would like to have more formal training sessions instead of teacher awareness sessions, but financial constraints make it impossible.[31]

The CCE $500 yearly stipend given to each Project Citizen state coordinator is not sufficient for coordinators to hold statewide training sessions. However, some coordinators have discovered that they can maximize their financial resources and serve larger audiences by hosting their Project Citizen training sessions in conjunction with related activities. For example, training sessions often take place during middle school or social studies conferences, in conjunction with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* training sessions, and during school in-service days. For example, California, Ohio, and Idaho state coordinators use school in-service days to train Project Citizen teachers. In-service training means that training is held on a regular school day and that the teacher receives pay for his or her attendance; in the case of these three states, the individual schools that organize the in-service training are responsible for reimbursing teachers for their time.

Some coordinators have close working relationships with local school districts that enable them to use district resources to implement Project Citizen. For example, coordinators may use school district facilities to hold training sessions or insert Project Citizen information in district mailings. As an example, given their working relationships with local school districts, California regional coordinators Jack Gaffney and Pat Hitchcock are able to use school district facilities to conduct teacher training sessions.[32]

Untimely Training Sessions

Another problem in many states is that training sessions are not held frequently enough or they are not held at the best time for teachers interested in using Project Citizen. More often than not, training sessions are held just once during the year. An Alabama teacher suggests having an introduction to Project Citizen at the beginning of every school year.[33] Other teachers expressed an interest in attending Project Citizen training during the summer so that they would have the opportunity to use Project Citizen early in the school year. Still others stated that since Project Citizen fits better in their spring semester course schedule, they may be better served with a spring training session. Our research does not make clear whether this issue of untimely training sessions is indeed a serious problem—and if so, whether it results from inadequate communication between state coordinators and teachers as to the optimal time for these sessions.

Insufficient Technical Assistance

Another barrier to Project Citizen program expansion recognized by CCE and the state coordinators is that they are unable to provide sufficient follow-up with teachers after they complete their training and information sessions. Pennsylvania state coordinator Lon Weber and others commented that it is important to have continuing follow-up with teachers after the training sessions.[34] In addition, in many cases there is no contact with teachers after they receive Project Citizen books. As a result, state coordinators and CCE often do not know for sure whether these teachers have chosen to use the program, and if not, the reasons why. Moreover, teachers who contact CCE directly to request Project Citizen books often never know about teacher training that may be available in their respective states.

Teachers suggest they would find it helpful to speak with other teachers who use Project Citizen about the strategies they use to implement the program with different types of students. According to Barbara Strom, a Washington teacher who began using the program for the first time in January 1998, it would be helpful if other teachers with experience in using Project Citizen in class were available for consultation.[35] In Alabama, for example, teachers exchange telephone numbers with other Project Citizen teachers in their state during training sessions and talk about the best ways to use Project Citizen with their own students, but a more systematic approach to information sharing would be useful in all states.

Unavailable Lesson Plans

Another obstacle, according to Arizona state coordinator Lynda Rando, is that teachers are typically interested in seeing a prepared lesson plan for the Project Citizen curriculum.[36] In other words, they would like to see a progressive calendar of daily objectives so that they are clear on what should be taught and how much time should be spent on various topics. Since Project Citizen is not designed around a fixed instructional framework, some teachers are not clear about what to teach.[37] Montana teacher Deanna Collins finds it challenging to develop activities that relate to the students' topic of choice and reports that Project Citizen materials are of limited help in this regard.[38] A teacher in Huntington Beach, California, complements his Project Citizen instruction by using prepared lesson plans on local government from the Thomas Bros. Maps Educational Foundation.[39] Such lesson plans include a class activity requiring students to rank city government services in importance (e.g., redevelopment of blighted areas, development of low-income housing) to help students identify community public policy concerns.

Inadequate Teacher Foundations in Civic Education

Some state coordinators express concern that teachers often lack the civics background necessary to teach Project Citizen effectively. Pamela Riley, North Carolina state coordinator, believes that teachers need more training in civics in order to feel comfortable teaching Project Citizen.[40] Arizona state coordinator Lynda Rando notes that it is common during teacher training sessions for teachers not to understand the concept of public policy.[41] "Teachers," she adds, "need a format through which to learn and then teach state and local government."[42] For example, they need to learn what a state agency is and where policies are developed. Kentucky teacher trainer Deborah Williamson states that, as part of the training sessions she conducts, she instructs teachers on how to get on the meeting agenda of a legislative body such as a city council.[43]

Some teachers, including Pete Snetsinger in California, report that in order to use Project Citizen in their classes, they first have to teach their students about different government jurisdictions, such as when an issue is the responsibility of a local school board instead of the city council.[44] However, other teachers, including Florida teachers Maria Ramirez and Alicia Otero, believe that their own background in civics is not strong enough for them to teach Project Citizen.[45] Thus some teachers believe that Project Citizen materials alone are sometimes not sufficient for them to teach Project Citizen, given their perception that civics instruction is needed as well.

Ohio teacher Vicki Keck believes that Project Citizen needs to be supplemented with related instructional material. For example, even after completing the Project Citizen program her students were unsure of federalism concepts; in this instance, the roles of the various levels of government were not fully discussed and understood by students during the portfolio activity.[46]

Recommendations

Project Citizen state coordinators, despite their scarce resources and, in some instances, their own lack of training or teaching experience, have taken significant steps to ensure that teachers are trained to use Project Citizen. As this chapter has shown, however, teacher training approaches vary widely. The different training strategies highlighted in this chapter suggest successful approaches to training that may be replicable in other states. At the same time, barriers must be overcome if teachers are to be prepared to use Project Citizen effectively in the classroom and community. Such challenges include the lack of training for state coordinators, insufficient financial resources, the untimeliness of training sessions, insufficient technical assistance available to teachers, the lack of prepared lesson plans, and some teachers' lack of a foundation in civic education.

The following recommendations identify ways in which CCE and state coordinators can address these barriers and improve Project Citizen teacher training nationwide.

1. *CCE should provide Project Citizen state coordinators with the technical support and guidelines needed to conduct effective teacher training sessions, as well as ensure that coordinators who are not experienced in organizing and conducting training sessions receive such training themselves.* CCE should, for example, develop guidelines for coordinators and other Project Citizen teacher trainers outlining the steps that need to be taken to organize a training session (e.g., obtaining the right kind of room, reminding participants three days in advance of the session) and the basic elements of effective training sessions (e.g., typical schedules, use of hands-on activities). CCE also should identify state coordinators who are successful teacher trainers and provide (minimal) support to them to serve as resources to other coordinators; highlight in CCE newsletters innovative teacher training sessions; and dedicate a section of its web site to teacher training successes and concerns.

2. *Project Citizen state coordinators should plan and conduct teacher training sessions that are responsive to teacher needs with respect to session content, location, time, and length.* Holding training sessions at statewide conferences can cut down on training and travel expenses, for example, but might limit the length and comprehensiveness of the sessions. Coordinators' training plans should include two types of sessions, each serving a different purpose: information sessions and "how to" sessions (at least half a day in length and often longer). The former could be used to inform potential Project Citizen teachers, their principals, and other interested parties generally about CCE and Project Citizen, while the latter could be used for more rigorous, hands-on training of teachers seriously considering using the program. Coordinators should vary the location of training sessions, as well as provide multiple training opportunities for teachers throughout the year. Finally, coordinators should build on their working relationships with local schools and school districts by holding teacher in-service training sessions in these facilities.

3. *CCE should develop a guidebook for teachers on the use of Project Citizen in the classroom and community that could be used as a resource book by teachers and state coordinators during both teacher training and classroom use.* This guidebook, which would supplement the student and teacher guides, could address such topics as preparing sample lesson plans, telling students what public policy is, helping students limit their policy problem to make it manageable, handling potentially sensitive portfolio topics, and preparing students for the possibility that government officials will not respond to their letters or telephone calls. The guidebook, perhaps in loose-leaf notebook form, should be easily updated to incorporate suggestions and new topics from teachers and state coordinators. A teacher who requests student and teacher guides directly from CCE should receive with these materials an information sheet describing supplemental Project Citizen materials such as this guidebook, as well as encouragement to contact his or her state coordinator to learn about upcoming teacher training sessions in the state and how to obtain the guidebook.

4. *Project Citizen state coordinators should explore alternative ways to provide technical assistance and other follow-up support to teachers who complete their Project Citizen training.* Effective follow-up, which could have a significant impact on the number of trained teachers who actually use Project Citizen, should be the responsibility of state coordinators or experienced Project Citizen teachers who volunteer to serve as mentors to teachers using the program for the first time. Coordinators also should explore ways in which to involve experienced Project Citizen teachers in teacher training sessions, even if the experienced teachers are not responsible for conducting the entire session. Technical assistance provided by coordinators could include providing teachers city-specific government and community resource lists, providing teachers with lists of Project Citizen teachers in nearby school districts who are willing to serve as mentors or resources, facilitating teacher visits to classrooms that are using Project Citizen, and holding Project Citizen teacher "dialogues" at state or local educator conferences and at Project Citizen competitions.

5. *Project Citizen state coordinators, using assessment instruments developed jointly with CCE as well as state-specific forms, should evaluate each teacher training session to ensure that the sessions meet teachers' needs, state coordinator guidelines, and CCE expectations.* The use of a brief, common assessment instrument across all states provides comparability and consistency of the information received from teachers, while the incorporation of a state-specific section (if the coordinator so chooses) allows each coordinator to assess the training sessions relative to state objectives and priorities. State coordinators should involve selected Project Citizen teachers and Project Citizen Advisory Committee members in the development and review of the assessments, as well as use the assessments to improve future training sessions.

6. *CCE should work with Project Citizen state coordinators and teachers to develop a Project Citizen video for use by teacher trainers, teachers, students, and state coordinators.* This video, which would prepare teachers and students to use Project Citizen and assist teachers who are unable to attend training sessions, should demonstrate what is actually involved in using Project Citizen. The video could include examples of Project Citizen activities being carried out in the classroom and in the community, articulate the purposes of Project Citizen,

examine sequentially each of the six steps involved with using Project Citizen, discuss competitions and simulated hearings as well as portfolios, and anticipate questions that teachers and students might have about the program. It would be important to include in the video students and teachers talking about the different elements of Project Citizen, as well as about the program's substantial benefits to students and communities.

7. *CCE, in consultation with Project Citizen state coordinators, should conduct each summer a multiday Project Citizen teacher training workshop to develop a national network of teachers able not only to use Project Citizen effectively but also to prepare other teachers in their respective regions and states to teach Project Citizen.* Particular attention should be given by CCE to keeping Project Citizen state coordinators fully informed about the purposes, program, and participants of the national workshop. State coordinators should be consulted in the selection of teacher participants for the national workshop, which would provide attendees grounding in public policymaking, classroom applications of Project Citizen, and in-service approaches for incorporating Project Citizen into middle school curricula. State coordinators should consider building on the national workshop by organizing state summer institutes at which former participants in the national workshop serve as trainers and mentors and where teachers come to the State Capitol, meet with legislators and their staff, and gain a more in-depth understanding of how government works.

8. *CCE should explore ways in which NCSL materials that explain the basics of lawmaking and the state government process could be distributed to Project Citizen teachers and state coordinators.* Teachers who are familiar with this material praise it, and its provision to Project Citizen classrooms would improve teachers' and students' understanding of public policy and increase the effectiveness of Project Citizen. State coordinators should explore ways in which this NCSL material could be incorporated into Project Citizen teacher training sessions.

Notes

[1] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[2] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[8] Project Citizen presentation by Norm Goldberg, Project Citizen Teacher, Wood Middle School, San Antonio, Texas, at Law-Related Education Workshop, State Bar of Texas, Austin, Tex., March 7, 1998.

[9] Telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Pat Hitchcock, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Regions 8 and 9, Newport Beach, California, March 31, 1998.

[10] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[11] Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education, 1996-97 Project Citizen pilot program evaluations by Project Citizen teachers, Birmingham, Ala., September 29, 1997.

[12] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Sharon Kaohi, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 11, 1998.

[13] Telephone interview by Lisa Driskill with Barbara Miller, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boulder, Colorado, February 5, 1998.

[14] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Dan Prinzing, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boise, Idaho, October 14, 1997.

[15] Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop Evaluation Forms, Miami and Tampa, Fla., November 19 and 20, 1997.

[16] Telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Tom Middleton, Project Citizen Teacher Trainer, San Diego, California, March 14, 1998.

[17] Interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Gail Huschle, Project Citizen Teacher, St. Croix Catholic School, Stillwater, Minnesota, January 7, 1998.

[18] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[19] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[20] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Dan Prinzing, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boise, Idaho, October 14, 1998.

[21] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Pat Hitchcock, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Regions 8 and 9, Fountain Valley, California, February 11, 1998.

[22] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[23] Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop Evaluation Forms.

[24] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[25] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Lynette McBrayer, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Jackson, Mississippi, January 29, 1998.

[26] Ibid.

[27] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[28] Rando interview.

[29] Telephone interview by Brandi Stewart with Dora Marroquin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Albuquerque, New Mexico, October 2, 1997.

[30] Interview by Rachel Feit with Libby Cupp, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Lima, Ohio, January 29, 1998.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Hitchcock interview, February 11, 1998.

[33] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[34] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Lon Weber, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, February 12, 1998.

[35] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Barbara Strom, Project Citizen Teacher, Tahoma Junior High, Maple Valley, Washington, February 4, 1998.

[36] Rando interview.

[37] Ibid.

[38] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[39] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Pete Snetsinger, Project Citizen Teacher, Marina High School, Huntington Beach, California, February 11, 1998.

[40] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina, January 14, 1998.

[41] Rando interview.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Interview by Maria Gutierrez with Deborah Williamson, Project Citizen Teacher Trainer, Frankfurt, Kentucky, March 26, 1998.

[44] Snetsinger interview.

[45] Interview by Sarah Wheat with teachers attending a Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop sponsored by the Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., Tampa, Florida, November 20, 1997.

[46] Interview by Rachel Feit with Vicki Keck, Project Citizen Teacher, Groveport-Madison Middle School South, Groveport, Ohio, January 30, 1998.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

Each One Teaches One at Indiana Middle School

In Lafayette, Indiana, students in Leila Meyerratken's class at Sunnyside Middle School identified illiteracy as an important problem in their community. The students, meeting as an after-school Project Citizen club, decided to create "literacy bags" for neighborhood children to promote reading. First, the students conducted research at the library and decided that Head Start would be the best recipient for their contributions. "I really wasn't aware of the Head Start program. I learned how you can get involved," said student Jessica Harris. Next, the students asked for donations of books, bag materials, and tapes from local businesses. "She handled herself so professionally and did it so politely," said Bill Powers, President of Salin Bank in Lafayette, describing being contacted by student Tanya Couch and asked to donate funds to the literacy project. Then, after Sunnyside Middle School parents loaned the class their sewing machines and volunteer hours, the students turned Meyerratken's classroom into a sewing factory for a few days. In the end, the students produced 237 homemade bags, with a book and a tape of a student reading the book aloud in each bag. "It made me feel good to do something for someone else," observed Amanda Brown.[1]

---

[1] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Leila Meyerratken, Project Citizen Teacher, Sunnyside Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 20, 1998; and Paula Rawson, "Student Project Delivers Community Service, Learning Materials to Head Start," *Lafayette Leader*, School section (January 16, 1998), pp. 4-5.

Chapter 6. Teacher and Class Use

Project Citizen offers tremendous opportunities and challenges for teacher and class use. This is true largely because Project Citizen, unlike most other educational curricula, prescribes the type of outcome in some detail, but leaves a great deal of latitude in the process by which a class reaches this outcome and in the substance of the outcome itself. Curricula for other educational programs typically focus a great deal on daily activities and assignments and less on the semester or year-long outcomes. In Project Citizen the final project, a policy portfolio, is the primary emphasis, while daily activities are left largely to a teacher's discretion.

The Project Citizen guide offers six steps through which each class is to progress in order to create a portfolio. These six steps are (1) identifying public policy problems in the community; (2) selecting a problem for class study; (3) gathering information on the problem the class will study; (4) developing a class portfolio; (5) presenting the portfolio; and (6) reflecting on the learning experience.[1] Within these six steps, teachers decide how best to incorporate Project Citizen into their daily classes.

This chapter examines teacher and class use of Project Citizen and the different ways in which teachers respond to the opportunities and challenges in the program.

Classes in which Project Citizen is Used

Teachers use Project Citizen in a variety of classes. These classes vary with regard to subject matter, grade level of the students, and ability level of the students.

Subject Matter of Classes

Project Citizen most naturally fits in the curriculum of a social science class. In fact, 98 percent of teachers surveyed believe that Project Citizen is a good way to teach civic education. The goal of the program, to "[d]evelop students' commitment to active citizenship and governance,"[2] reflects the goal of many civics and U.S. history courses. Moreover, Project Citizen

1. provides students with the knowledge and skills required for effective citizen participation,
2. provides students with the practical experience designed to foster a sense of competence and efficacy, and
3. develops student understanding of the importance of citizen participation.[3]

Project Citizen teachers agree that the program helps their students gain a great number of skills related to social studies, including skills in research, communication, and problem solving. As shown in table 6.1, for all 13 key education goals about which the teachers were asked, teachers rate Project Citizen highly on how well the program helps students achieve these goals, giving average ratings of 3.0 to 3.6 on each goal (where 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, and 4=considerably). Fifty percent or more of the respondents said Project Citizen helps their students "considerably" with respect to improving their cooperative problem solving skills, learning more about community problems, increasing their knowledge of resources to solve problems, improving their research skills, and gaining awareness of their potential to have an impact on their community. The only goal for which fewer than 30 percent of the teachers gave a "considerably" rating was developing a more favorable attitude toward government, and even in this instance 67 percent responded "considerably" or "somewhat."[4]

Table 6.1
Teachers' Perspectives on How Well Project Citizen Helps Students Achieve Education Goals

Education Goal	**Average Response**
Improve cooperative problem solving skills	3.6
Learn more about community problems	3.6
Learn how to apply solutions to problems	3.5
Increase knowledge of resources to solve problems	3.5
Improve communication skills	3.5
Improve research skills	3.5
Gain an understanding of responsibilities of citizens	3.4
Develop a greater understanding of public policy	3.4
Gain awareness of their potential to have an impact on their Community	3.4
Gain a better understanding of government processes	3.3
Gain awareness of community groups	3.2
Develop a more favorable attitude toward government	3.0
Develop an understanding of using a portfolio as a means of communication and persuasion	3.0

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Note: Average Response: 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, 4=considerably

While a majority of the classes that teachers report have used Project Citizen are social studies classes of one type or another, the program can work well in classes covering many subject areas (see table 6.2). This is true because the program offers so much freedom to the teacher in developing lesson plans, and because Project Citizen can be used to develop a wide variety of skills (see table 6.1). Thus teachers can find ways to use it in many different kinds of classes, from a foreign language class in Indiana to a language arts class in Arizona.

Table 6.2
Subject Matter of Project Citizen Classes

Subject Matter	Number of Classes	Percentage of Classes
English/Language Arts	3	2
Government/Civics	9	7
Humanities	12	9
Social Studies/History	66	49
Social Studies/Language Arts Mixed	13	10
Other	19	16
Not Reported	9	7

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Project Citizen also is used in middle school instructional clusters. In this situation, a group of teachers, usually four, is able to create an interdisciplinary project. This method of instruction is ideal for Project Citizen in that it allows students to use a variety of skills from many classes to complete a project. This strategy also allows teachers to collaborate on a portfolio. While our research did not reveal how many teachers use Project Citizen in this manner, classes in Indiana, Ohio, and Texas reported that they either have used this strategy or are planning to use it.[5]

Project Citizen is sometimes used outside traditional classroom settings. In Washington, for example, Ana Jimenez-Inman uses the program at Sea Mar South Residential Treatment Center for youth from eighth to twelfth grade who are part of a drug and alcohol treatment program.[6] The program offers her students a good alternative to a typical U.S. history class because they can choose to study topics that are more current and relevant to them. Similarly, the State of Kentucky's Administrative Office of the Courts uses Project Citizen and encourages caseworkers and counselors to use Project Citizen with their teen groups; this is a way for teens to learn about their communities and about themselves.[7] Clearly the flexibility of Project Citizen makes it appropriate for many instructional settings.

Grade Levels of Classes

Teachers have discretion about the grade level with which to use Project Citizen. While Project Citizen is geared toward middle school classes, students of many ages participate in the program. Teachers reported that Project Citizen is most commonly used in eighth grade classes, although it is frequently used in sixth and seventh grade classes as well (see table 6.3).

In addition, several state coordinators mentioned using Project Citizen with younger and older classes. In North Carolina, Judith Dempsey, a guidance counselor, uses Project Citizen with 60 fifth graders. While she found the project, and particularly the research, challenging, her class was able to complete a project, including interviews with a county commissioner and a state legislator at the end of the project.[8] Ana Jimenez-Inman, as noted above, uses Project Citizen in Washington with students as advanced as twelfth grade.

Table 6.3
Grade Levels of Project Citizen Classes

Grade Levels	Number of Classes	Percentage of Classes
6th grade	23	17
7th grade	25	19
7th-8th grade mixed	11	8
8th grade	49	37
9th grade	13	9
Other grades/combinations	11	8
Not reported	2	2

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Academic Ability Levels of Classes

Project Citizen can be used with students in courses reflecting a wide variety of academic ability levels, or "tracks." As shown in table 6.4, the majority of teachers reporting that they have used Project Citizen have done so in a regular or mixed ability class (62 percent). Gifted and talented classes also commonly use Project Citizen. In addition, a smaller number of remedial and special education classes use the program. One teacher in Arizona used Project Citizen successfully in her special education classroom and came in a very close second in the December 1997 state competition. Similarly, Jeffrey Behrends, a Washington teacher, uses Project Citizen with five learning disabled students. He believes that the program is particularly effective with these students, because he can adapt the activities to best fit their needs and abilities.[9]

Some teachers believe that the requirements of Project Citizen make it very difficult for an average ability class to use it successfully. In fact, teachers rated the abilities of students as the third highest challenge (of nine) in using Project Citizen; this challenge trailed only the time required in class and the time required outside of class (see table 6.5).[10] In addition to needing students who are highly motivated and well-disciplined, teachers believe that the success of a Project Citizen project depends on students not being absent from class very often. For these reasons, a few teachers reported that they can best use Project Citizen in their gifted and talented classes. It is clear, however, that the majority of teachers believe that Project Citizen can be used with students of any academic ability level.

Table 6.4
Academic Ability Levels of Project Citizen Classes

Academic Ability Levels	Number of Classes	Percentage of Classes
Mixed Ability	60	45
Regular	23	17
Gifted/Talented	17	13
More Than One category	16	12
Special Education	4	3
Remedial	2	2
Not Reported	10	8

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998

Challenges and Opportunities

Teachers are faced with a number of challenges and opportunities when using Project Citizen. This section discusses selected questions teachers face when using Project Citizen, as well as the methods that teachers use to take advantage of the opportunities the program offers. Topics addressed in this section include

- how much time is dedicated to Project Citizen;
- how Project Citizen fits into state and local curricula and standards;
- how Project Citizen materials are used and viewed by teachers;
- how teachers implement Project Citizen in their classrooms;
- what financial support and resources are needed to complete Project Citizen;
- how parents are involved in Project Citizen; and
- what topics are chosen for Project Citizen portfolios.

How Much Time is Dedicated to Project Citizen

Because Project Citizen does not prescribe daily activities for a class to complete, teachers have a great deal of freedom to determine how much time they will dedicate to the program. Pam Luenz in Indiana began her Project Citizen project after spring break and finished it in about four weeks, by the beginning of May. Other teachers prefer to use eight weeks. A Kentucky teacher insists that nine weeks is required to complete the project well. One Texas teacher who uses Project Citizen in a teen law class chooses to use an entire semester to complete the project. Vicki Keck in Ohio prefers to have an entire year to complete Project Citizen. Among the teachers surveyed, their Project Citizen classes spend, on average, 3.9 hours per week for 6.1 weeks working on the program.[11]

While 75 percent of the teachers using Project Citizen reported using it as a curricular program during regular class hours, the program also is used outside of class. Twenty percent of the teachers reported using Project Citizen either as an extracurricular activity (6 percent) or as a combination of curricular and extracurricular activities (14 percent).[12]

It is interesting to note how much time teachers report needing per week outside of class to prepare for Project Citizen. The majority of teachers who use the program (68 percent) reported spending between one and five hours per week preparing for Project Citizen, while 22 percent reported spending between six and ten hours per week. No teacher reported spending more than ten hours per week outside of class preparing for Project Citizen. The remaining 10 percent of the teachers either did not respond to this question or reported spending no time outside of class.[13]

The number of hours spent by teachers outside the classroom preparing to use Project Citizen may not appear large. Nevertheless, among all teachers completing our survey, including those who had taught Project Citizen as well as those who had received Project Citizen materials but decided not to teach it, '"time required in class" and "time required outside of class" are perceived as the two greatest barriers (see table 6.5).[14]

Table 6.5
Challenges Perceived by Teachers to Using Project Citizen

Challenge	Average Response
Uncomfortable with subject matter	1.2
Lack of support from school administration	1.6
Training was inadequate to get started	1.8
Already have successful method for Teaching civics	1.8
State curricular requirements	1.9
District curricular requirements	2.0
Abilities of students	2.3
Time required outside of class	2.6
Time required in class	2.6

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Note: Average Response: 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, 4=considerably

Some teachers are concerned that block scheduling plans make completing Project Citizen difficult. Block scheduling frequently allows less class time for students than traditional scheduling. At the same time, other teachers see block scheduling as a great advantage for using Project Citizen, because they see the longer periods as an excellent time for students to meet in groups and participate more actively in learning. Students have the luxury of using longer class periods to conduct interviews, research their portfolio topic, and construct the portfolio.

Teachers' differing opinions and practices regarding the time spent on Project Citizen stem from the manner in which the Project Citizen text presents the material. At no time does the text suggest time limits or even recommendations for activities. Thus teachers are entirely free to choose any amount of time they see fit to complete the Project Citizen program.

How Project Citizen Fits into State and Local Curricula and Standards

State standards can serve as a great incentive for teachers to use Project Citizen. Many states have established, or are establishing, standards that make Project Citizen an attractive option. Sixty percent of teachers surveyed report that Project Citizen meets state curriculum requirements.[15] However, teachers also rated district and state requirements as the fourth and fifth greatest challenges, respectively, to using Project Citizen (see table 6.5).

In a number of states, including Colorado, service learning is required. Project Citizen can be very effective in fulfilling this requirement. The fact that Project Citizen requires students to work within their communities to identify and solve a problem makes Project Citizen an ideal way for teachers to offer a service learning element. In addition, the state coordinator for Hawaii expects that Project Citizen will work well with the social studies standards that are being developed in that state.[16]

In other states, Project Citizen is not perceived by teachers as fitting well with state standards. For example, according to teachers in Florida, Project Citizen does not match the state standards. Teachers in Miami-Dade County have reported they have so many other requirements, such as African-American history and Holocaust history, that it is difficult for them to fit Project Citizen into their curriculum.[17] In Ohio, teachers feel a responsibility for ensuring their students pass the Ohio Proficiency Test given annually to students in grades six and eight (and other grades) and thus spend a great deal of time in preparation for this exam. At least one Ohio teacher believes that Project Citizen is not an effective tool for preparing students for this exam.[18]

Yet, in many states, teachers use creative methods to ensure that students achieve state standards while completing Project Citizen. Because Project Citizen offers a wide variety of skill development activities, including research skills, communication skills, and cooperative problem-solving skills, the program can be used in nearly any class. Dee Motz, a sixth-grade Project Citizen teacher in Indiana, faces the challenge of fitting Project Citizen into a social studies curriculum that focuses on Latin America and Canada. Motz sees that "Project Citizen is a bit of a diversion from that."[19] Nevertheless, because the goal of Motz's interdisciplinary team is to develop good citizens, she has begun to work with the language arts teacher in her cluster to develop an interdisciplinary project that incorporates Project Citizen. Teachers like Motz who are able to look at curricular requirements broadly are able to see the opportunities that Project Citizen offers for many classes.

Since state curriculum requirements are relatively new in many states, some teachers do not yet understand exactly what is required and therefore do not understand exactly how Project Citizen can fit into classroom activities. As mentioned in chapter 5, some state coordinators are striving to match Project Citizen elements to their state standards—and more would like to see it but lack the time to prepare a correlation matrix. If Project Citizen can be shown to fulfill curriculum requirements and meet standards, many more teachers are likely to implement Project Citizen in many additional classrooms.

Several teachers who responded to our survey explained that while they liked Project Citizen, they had already developed other activities that addressed the student needs and skills that Project Citizen addresses.[20] This practice, coupled with the fact that Project Citizen is perceived by many teachers to be a time-consuming program, makes it less likely that experienced teachers will adopt Project Citizen.

An additional curriculum challenge for teachers wishing to use Project Citizen is fitting the program into their schools' course sequences. One teacher reported that Project Citizen is already used at one grade level at her school and that it would be redundant for her students to go through the process twice. Other teachers note that their middle school curriculum already fills all available time and that no time is available for Project Citizen. These very real challenges become even more difficult when classroom, school, and district curricula requirements are combined with the state standards to which teachers must adhere.

How Project Citizen Materials Are Used and Viewed by Teachers

Teacher comments regarding the Project Citizen text (i.e., the student and teacher guides) focus primarily on three topics: (1) the level of the text, (2) the resources needed to supplement the text, and (3) the need for clearer guidelines within the text.

Inevitably, teachers have widely divergent views of the level of the book, considering the wide range of grade levels and ability levels that use the same text. Vicky Kreunen, an Arizona Project Citizen teacher of sixth graders, thinks the book is much too easy, noting that "[i]t is very repetitive. The students even complained about that."[21] Other teachers simply think the reading material is not challenging enough for their students. On the other hand, a number of teachers, including another sixth-grade Arizona teacher, think the book is too challenging because it lacks explanation.[22]

Teachers identified a number of problems they perceive in the Project Citizen student guide. Many teachers complained about the lack of thoroughness in the text. Some teachers want more preparation for their students so they can complete a town hall-style meeting. Others want more detailed criteria for the portfolio, including pictures of portfolios, rather than the cartoons that are in the current Project Citizen student guide. Others want more information about how to put the portfolio together. One Ohio teacher wants the text to include a lesson on what to do if public officials are unresponsive to students' needs.[23]

But, again, teacher comments are diverse, and the sentiment that the text is incomplete is far from universal. One Pennsylvania teacher said, "It is like a bible, this book."[24] She views it as one of the best guides she has ever used, particularly liking its versatility.

Several Project Citizen teachers in California were critical of the Project Citizen text because they believe it is not available in a Spanish language version.[25] However, CCE does produce a Spanish language version; Florida teachers are aware of it and are looking forward to using it, for example. It appears some California teachers are unaware of the availability of such a version.

Often teachers reported that the Project Citizen text was not sufficient to teach civics. But again teachers disagree about what supplemental materials are needed in addition to the Project Citizen text. For example, Project Citizen teacher Carol Gillin of Pennsylvania finds the text to be challenging because her students have no previous civics background. Over one-half of the Project Citizen teachers (53 percent) in our survey use *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* as the foundation program for their civics course and then use Project Citizen as a supplement. Four percent of the teachers, including one in New Mexico, use Project Citizen in conjunction with CCE's *Foundations of Democracy*. The remaining teachers (43 percent) reported they do not use other CCE materials; however, some states, including Florida and Arizona, use law-related education materials to supplement the Project Citizen text.[26]

How Teachers Implement Project Citizen in Their Classrooms

Project Citizen offers an excellent opportunity for students to participate in group work. Teachers organize their classrooms to take advantage of this opportunity in many different ways. While the Project Citizen text suggests dividing the class into four groups, each to work on one section of the project, teachers make their own judgments about how well this approach will work in their own classes. Many teachers find it a challenge to deal with a class of students all completing different activities. Some teachers take the opportunity to set up truly independent work groups for their students. Joanne Dien of California divides her class into groups, but instead of having each group work on one part of the project, she has each group develop its own project and portfolio. Dee Motz also sees an advantage to using smaller groups. She argues that "this type of project works best with a smaller group of students."[27]

Pam Luenz, former Project Citizen teacher in Indiana, echoes this sentiment: "I feel strongly that this should not be restricted to use as a whole class activity, but teachers should have the option of splitting their class into groups investigating more than one problem."[28] Teachers favor this strategy because the steps through which a Project Citizen class progresses are sequential, from identifying a problem to brainstorming solutions to presenting one solution. Thus, having different groups simultaneously working on different stages of the project can be challenging.

Regardless of how teachers arrange their classes into groups, they consistently praise Project Citizen as an excellent program for teaching cooperative work. As noted in table 6.1, teachers using Project Citizen rate the program highest in terms of its success in helping students "improve cooperative problem solving skills." In fact, all but one of the teachers responding to this question reported that Project Citizen improved their students' skills in this area "considerably" or "somewhat."[29]

What Financial Support and Resources Are Needed to Complete Project Citizen

Because Project Citizen is different from most programs, teachers are faced with a new set of challenges when trying to get money and other resources to use for Project Citizen. Many teachers reported that, in addition to the student guides, they need considerable resources to make their students' experiences in Project Citizen a success. Five resource needs are most commonly cited:

1. Students need a telephone at school or at home to set up appointments and to conduct interviews easily. Maria Ramirez, a Florida Project Citizen teacher, finds that research is difficult to conduct because many of her students do not have a phone at home.

2. Students need a computer with Internet access. Although a computer is used primarily for research, it also is helpful in putting together the portfolio. A few classes create web sites with information from their portfolios.

3. Students need e-mail access. E-mail communications with government officials and other resource persons often provide students with more information on a more timely basis than other means of communication (e.g., postal mail).

4. Students need access to a library with research materials. If students are to achieve the program's goal and improve their research skills, they must be able to search for and use diverse materials both in print form (e.g., periodicals) and in electronic form.

5. Teachers need money for some student project costs. Twenty-six percent of Project Citizen teachers reported raising money for their students' use in completing the Project Citizen program.[30] Shelly Chumley, an Alabama teacher, worries that without supplemental funding, "teachers would have to pay for supplies and activities out of their own limited funds."[31] In large states a statewide competition is difficult to conduct, given the student travel expenses, unless additional funds are available. For example, Sally Broughton, the Montana state coordinator, is concerned that teachers and students will not be able to afford the trip to the state competition site without financial assistance.[32]

How Parents Are Involved in Project Citizen

Project Citizen offers an opportunity for teachers to involve parents in the classroom. Janet Thor, a Project Citizen teacher in Arizona, uses parents as chaperones on field trips, e.g., to the local juvenile detention center and to the State Capitol for the Project Citizen state competition.[33] Judy Carnine, an Indiana teacher, has parents organize receptions for students after their presentations.[34] Vicki Keck, an Ohio teacher, has parents serve as resources to students for their research.[35] Other teachers thought it best that parents not be involved in Project Citizen, however, hoping students would remain in charge of the project.

Overall, teachers using Project Citizen reported substantial parental involvement with Project Citizen (see table 6.6).[36] Most commonly, parents donate time (41 percent of classrooms) and supplies (41 percent). In addition, many parents help students select the public policy topic (38 percent) and create the portfolio (19 percent).[37] It is interesting to note that while 26 percent of teachers reported raising money for Project Citizen (see previous section), no teachers reported that parents are involved in fund-raising.

Table 6.6
Parental Involvement With Project Citizen

Type of Parental Involvement	Percentage Reporting Involvement
Donate time	41
Donate supplies	41
Help generate public policy topic	38
Help create portfolio	19
Serve as portfolio judge	13
Provide financial support	6
Help implement policy recommendations	6
Help raise funds	0
Other	3
OVERALL	**67**

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Note: Percentages add to more than 100 percent due to multiple responses.

What Topics Are Chosen for Project Citizen Portfolios

Project Citizen teachers and their classes have a great deal of latitude in selecting topics for their Project Citizen portfolios. They can work on any community or school problem they believe is important to their communities. Table 6.7 lists recent Project Citizen portfolio topics reported by state coordinators and teachers.

Selecting a portfolio topic can pose a challenge to teachers and administrators, who sometimes are faced with handling sensitive topics. Topics such as sexual harassment might prove to be controversial or perhaps generate negative publicity for the school. Schools use many methods to deal with this challenge. One school principal concluded that maintaining a positive image is the highest priority for the school, and therefore he asked the Project Citizen teacher to steer students away from any topics that might bring negative publicity to the school. Another principal took a different approach and asked the teacher simply to make sure that students understood the principles of responsible research and reporting.

Table 6.7
Project Citizen Portfolio Topics

AIDS in schools/AIDS education
animal rights
bank lending practices toward churches in inner-city communities
bills to laws
car theft
child abuse
city beautification
domestic violence
dress codes
drinking; driving
need for stoplights
open campus issue
overcrowding in juvenile detention centers
overcrowding in schools
potholes
promoting use of Global Information System
racism
recycling
reducing class size in grades 4-8
school courtyard cleanup
sexual harassment in schools

drug use
due process
effectiveness of the war on drugs
environmental problems
first amendment rights; censorship
flashing lights for school speed zone
Gangs
Graffiti
gun control
high school dropouts
Homelessness
human growth and development
illegal dumping
juvenile detention center
lack of a variety of stores
lowering the voting age; why people don't vote
mandatory fingerprinting for all school-age children
music ratings
shoplifting
speed bumps
stray pets
student dress code
student rights
students attending public schools illegally
teen pregnancy
teen smoking
trash pick-up; lake bathhouse beautification
trees along the highway
underage drinking; delivery of alcohol to minors
U.S. drug policies
violence in community
yard waste
youth/police relations
youth recreation
zip codes

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, November 1997; and LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Recommendations

Project Citizen is a very effective method of teaching civic education and civic participation and of developing student skills in communication, research, and cooperative problem solving. The program also is sufficiently flexible that it can fit into a great many classroom situations. Project Citizen can be used effectively at many grade levels, in many different courses, and by students of many ability levels. Teachers have the freedom to shape the Project Citizen experience to fit the needs of their classrooms.

Because Project Citizen offers so much freedom, teachers have a great deal of responsibility for determining exactly how it will work in their classrooms. Teachers are largely on their own in determining how Project Citizen fits with state and district standards, how to best use and supplement the Project Citizen text, how to group students to complete the project, how to access the needed resources, and how to deal with controversial portfolio topics.

Following are recommendations to strengthen and increase teacher and class use of Project Citizen.

1. *Each Project Citizen state coordinator, working with CCE, should document (e.g., through a correlational matrix and an accompanying fact sheet) how Project Citizen links to state and district curriculum standards and assessments.* In this process, the coordinator should consult with state department of education officials, teachers, and school principals and social studies supervisors not only to produce an accurate document but also to inform education decision makers how Project Citizen fits into and supports state middle school curriculum and assessment objectives. CCE should assist by developing a basic framework that all state coordinators could use to construct their respective state documents, as well as

by providing guidance to teachers and coordinators on how Project Citizen could be adapted to fit state curriculum requirements. In states without social studies standards, state coordinators and CCE should work together to develop standards consistent with Project Citizen and other CCE civic education program objectives and materials.

2. *CCE should work with state coordinators to identify improvements in Project Citizen instructional materials that teachers recommend, then revise and supplement the Project Citizen teacher and student texts to make them more user-friendly and relevant.* To address teachers' concerns, for example, the teacher's guide could offer more suggestions for daily activities or time frames for completion of each program, as well as include the material from the student guide. The guides should perhaps be written at a more advanced level, including more examples and pictures of actual portfolios, and could clarify CCE and state coordinator expectations regarding teachers' flexibility in using Project Citizen. CCE should assess the feasibility of providing such supplemental material to Project Citizen teachers as simple guides on how students can participate effectively in town hall meetings, how to create a web-based portfolio, and how to incorporate excerpts from other CCE programs (e.g., *Foundations of Democracy*), as well as NCSL information on such topics as the basics of government. Their recommendations apply to both English language and Spanish language versions of the Project Citizen text.

3. *State coordinators should work with Project Citizen teachers to identify and promote instructional resources that are otherwise inaccessible to their students.* Coordinators could help provide teachers and students access to a research library, for example, or direct teachers to local businesses or community groups that may be willing to facilitate student use of fax machines, a computer, or the Internet. CCE could collaborate with state coordinators to produce a brief information sheet that advises teachers about what resources might be useful for a Project Citizen class and where they might be obtained.

4. *Project Citizen teachers should understand the classroom and community contexts within which students select their portfolio topics and be prepared to deal with controversial public policy topics and student recommendations.* Teachers should discuss the Project Citizen program and process with their principals and other school officials before using the program to ensure that all parties agree on school and community expectations. In their Project Citizen training sessions, state coordinators should include a discussion of potentially controversial topics and how other teachers have successfully addressed them. CCE should include in its Project Citizen guide for teachers a discussion of the possibility of controversy arising and of ways to manage such situations constructively.

5. *Since teacher and class use of Project Citizen is closely linked to teacher training and publicity, CCE and state coordinators should jointly develop expanded Project Citizen training and publicity initiatives.* National and state summer institutes to provide Project Citizen teacher trainers and teachers with greater understanding of such topics as how to monitor and influence public policy, how state and local governments work, how to use the Internet and web sites effectively, and how to generate publicity would produce the state resource and support networks of Project Citizen teachers necessary for the program's success. CCE and coordinators should provide guidance for Project Citizen teachers on how

to inform and involve media before and during the Project Citizen process, not only after a class portfolio is completed, as well as recognize teachers (as well as students) who use Project Citizen successfully.

6. *Each Project Citizen state coordinator, in collaboration with Project Citizen teachers and Project Citizen regional coordinators (if any) in the state, should foster and improve communication and information sharing among coordinators and teachers in the state, particularly electronic communication.* Such a network would be useful to current and potential Project Citizen teachers as a way to share information and insights about class use and the challenges and opportunities discussed in this chapter. The state coordinator should ensure that any such state networks are compatible with Project Citizen communication networks developed by CCE.

Notes

[1] Center for Civic Education, *We the People... Project Citizen Teacher's Guide* (Calabasas, Calif., 1996), pp. 11-17.

[2] Ibid., p. 7.

[3] Ibid.

[4] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Ana Jimenez-Inman, Project Citizen Teacher, Sea Mar South Residential Treatment Center, Des Moines, Washington, February 5, 1998.

[7] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Tracey Sharpe, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Middlesboro, Kentucky, October 9, 1997; and interview by Maria Gutierrez with Tracey Sharpe, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Middlesboro, Kentucky, February 27, 1998.

[8] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Judith Dempsey, Guidance Counselor, Central Elementary School, Maple, North Carolina, February 5, 1998.

[9] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Sharon Kaohi, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 11, 1998.

[17] Interview by Sarah Wheat with teachers attending a Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop sponsored by the Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., Miami, Florida, November 19, 1998.

[18] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[19] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Dee Motz, Project Citizen Teacher, Sunnyside Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[20] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[21] Interview by Writer Mott with Vicky Kreunen, Project Citizen Teacher, Alta Loma Elementary School, Peoria, Arizona, December 3, 1997.

[22] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Carol Gillin, Project Citizen Teacher, James Dobson School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 25, 1998.

[25] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Ruben Duenas, Project Citizen Teacher, Hollenbeck Middle School, Los Angeles, California, February 13, 1998.

[26] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[27] Motz interview.

[28] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Interview by Anne Ray with Shelly Chumley, Project Citizen Teacher, Morris, Alabama, February 19, 1998.

[32] Telephone interview by Pete Weber with Sally Broughton, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Bozeman, Montana, October 6, 1997.

[33] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[34] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Judy Carnine, Project Citizen Teacher, Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[35] Interview by Rachel Feit with Vicki Keck, Project Citizen Teacher, Groveport-Madison Middle School South, Groveport, Ohio, January 30, 1998.

[36] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[37] Ibid.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

Arizona Classroom Tackles AIDS Prevention in Tempe

Janet Thor's class at Kyrene Centennial Middle School in Tempe, Arizona, tackled the sensitive issue of sex education and AIDS awareness for their class project. After discovering that their school library didn't have any books about AIDS prevention, the students decided that their school district needed a more comprehensive sexual education curriculum to inform students about AIDS. "We found out that most students were not as informed as they should be," said student Katie Taylor. After extensive research and preparation, the students took their case to the Kyrene School Board, local radio stations, and Planned Parenthood and explained why an improved curriculum was needed in the Kyrene School District. Thor observed that the students learned that they can talk to adults and "learned how government works, and that you need to start at the grassroots level."[1]

---

[1] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997; and Don Harris, "The Making of Good Citizens," *State Legislatures* (March 1997), pp. 29, 31-32.

Chapter 7. Competitions

For many students and teachers, the Project Citizen experience includes participation in some form of competition at one or more of the following levels: local, regional, state, and national. Such competitions serve several purposes. First, participating in some type of competition allows students to display their portfolios to an outside audience and receive feedback and recognition of their efforts. Second, students who present and defend their portfolios before a panel of judges are given the opportunity to develop their oral communication skills and confidence in their abilities. Finally, Project Citizen competitions increase the visibility of the program and help to secure political and financial support from state and locally elected officials. While the competition may not be the main focus of Project Citizen for every class, it is an important aspect of the program and warrants more attention from CCE, state coordinators, teachers, elected officials, and even local media.

This chapter discusses the types and levels of Project Citizen competitions. It also highlights a few key issues, including student recognition and feedback, barriers to participation faced by students and teachers, and intended outcomes of the Project Citizen experience. Finally, recommendations for improving the competition component of Project Citizen are made.

Types and Levels of Competitions

Currently, there is no single type of competition being conducted in the states using Project Citizen. Competitions may take one of several forms and be held at several different levels, depending on the preference of the state coordinator and the number of classes participating throughout the state. Classes that win a local or regional competition go to a state competition, if the latter exists; classes that win at a state level are eligible to enter the national competition. State and local competitions may include only a display of Project Citizen portfolios, or they may include some type of student presentation. The national competition currently requires participating classrooms to send their portfolios to a central location for judging.

State Competitions

The most common form of competition is held at the state level and requires classes to submit their respective portfolios for judging. For the 1997-98 school year, 28 state competitions were planned.[1] The Project Citizen state coordinator usually organizes the competition and recruits community leaders, teachers, elected officials, and parents to volunteer as judges. As outlined in the Project Citizen guide, each section of the portfolio is judged based on completeness, clarity, information support, graphics, documentation, and constitutionality. The overall portfolio is judged on its persuasiveness, practicality, coordination, and reflection. Judges are provided with a score sheet and asked to score each portfolio on a scale of one to five. The scores are totaled to determine a winner.[2]

In Iowa, a variation of this form of competition has students attend the portfolio competition to answer questions from the judges. The 1997-98 Iowa competition, known as a "statewide convention," was held in Des Moines on March 5, 1998. During the convention, students made short presentations and answered judges' questions about their projects. Judges from the community evaluated and scored the portfolios. Students also had the opportunity to interact with state legislators and other community representatives at the convention. Portfolios were displayed at the state capitol for one week. The winning portfolio is representing Iowa at the 1998 national Project Citizen competition.[3]

Another form of competition requires students to participate in simulated public hearings. At least five states, including Arizona, Colorado, Indiana, Maine, and Wisconsin, hold or are planning to hold public hearings as part of their state competitions. Arizona and Colorado hold their hearings at the State Capitol. In Arizona, participating students travel to the State Capitol to present their portfolios in senate and house hearing rooms. Each presentation is divided into four groups to correspond with the four sections of the portfolio. The students from each group give an overview of their section to three different panels of judges. The judges then are given the opportunity to ask follow-up questions to the students. Several members of the Arizona Legislature participate by serving as speakers, judges, or presenters of the awards and winners. Not only does this experience give the students a chance to display their work, but it also allows state and local legislators to see how the program helps students learn about government and become involved in the community.[4]

Other states that use a variation on the hearings include Indiana and Pennsylvania. In Pennsylvania, each classroom that submits a portfolio is given 15 minutes to present and defend its portfolio in an outdoor amphitheater. At the competition, students also receive an introduction by an actor dressed as Benjamin Franklin, a tour of the Freedoms Foundation campus where the event is held, and awards from the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state director.[5] The Indiana hearings take place in the county courtroom of Tippecanoe County Judge Gregg Donat. Students come to the courthouse, present their portfolios, and answer questions from a panel of judges. The students also take a tour of the historic courthouse, after which the Indiana Bar Association hosts a pizza party for them. The event is usually opened by the mayor, and there is typically radio and TV coverage.[6]

Regional and Local Competitions

In at least two states, regional or local Project Citizen competitions are held, with winners advancing to the state competitions. California holds regional competitions in some of its ten regions, depending on a Project Citizen regional coordinator's ability to organize them. In 1996-97, San Diego was one of the few areas to hold a regional competition. At this level in California, competitions consist of classes submitting portfolios to a panel of judges selected by the Project Citizen regional coordinator. Winners are invited to compete at the statewide competition in Sacramento.[7]

The Wisconsin Project Citizen coordinator is planning to hold competitive hearings at the district level, with the winners moving on to a state hearing, but this has not yet been done. Pennsylvania is holding its first regional competitions (four regions) during the 1997-98 school year. The Project Citizen state coordinator anticipates having more than one competition per region due to the large number of portfolios expected and the distance between schools. The state and regional coordinators in Pennsylvania also are looking to develop a system in which a region having many classes with portfolios will be able to send more than one regional representative to the state competition.[8]

National Competition

The winning class in each state competition is eligible to participate in the Project Citizen national competition organized by CCE and held at the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) annual meeting. For the 1996-97 school year, the meeting and national competition took place in August 1997 in Philadelphia. A total of 18 student portfolios were exhibited at the competition. The judging took place over three rounds. Five finalists were named in the first two rounds, and the winner was chosen during the third round. Members of the NCSL executive committee and selected state legislative staff members served as judges. The winners were announced by the NCSL president, Alabama House Majority Leader Michael Box. The class representing Arizona received first place honors; second and third place were awarded to Alabama and Pennsylvania classes, respectively. Indiana and Iowa classes rounded out the top five, receiving honorable mention.[9]

The 1997-98 national competition will be held at the NCSL annual meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada, July 20-24, 1998. Plaques will be awarded to the top three classes, and all students whose classes submit portfolios to the competition will receive a signed certificate of achievement. While the current national competition consists only of portfolio judging, CCE's long-term goal is to conduct a national competition for Project Citizen that incorporates simulated legislative hearings, with the winning class from every state traveling to the site of the national competition to present and defend its portfolio before panels of judges.[10]

Student Recognition and Feedback

Recognizing the students and teachers who participate in Project Citizen competitions is very important. Without significant recognition at the state and national levels, teachers and students will be less inclined to complete a portfolio and submit it to the competition. Thus it is crucial that all students who participate in the competitions be rewarded publicly and on a timely basis for their efforts. Recognition also is a part of the learning process and will leave the students feeling more confident about their abilities and their overall Project Citizen experience.

At the state level, many Project Citizen state coordinators make an effort to ensure that all classes participating in the state competition receive some type of recognition. In several states, every student whose class is entered in the competition receives a ribbon or a certificate signed by a state representative. The top winners of the state competitions usually receive special recognition. North Carolina gives out t-shirts to the top three winners.[11] Idaho provides the teacher of the winning class with a $150 cash award.[12]

More than one-half of the states holding Project Citizen competitions display the students' portfolios at the State Capitol or at another public location. State coordinators often send out press releases to the local media to ensure coverage of the events. Winners in Alabama, Arizona, and Ohio have been featured in their local newspapers. The press coverage also helps to recognize the students and promote the visibility of Project Citizen.

According to CCE, all students who participate in the Project Citizen national competition receive a signed certificate of achievement, and plaques are awarded to the top three classes.[13] Several state coordinators, however, noted that neither CCE nor NCSL provided students with the proper acknowledgment after their portfolios were entered in and judged at the 1997 national competition. Students, who are unable to travel to the national competition, have very little closure if they never hear the final results or never receive recognition.

Janet Thor's eighth-grade Project Citizen class from Centennial Middle School in Phoenix, Arizona, received little recognition from CCE after winning the competition in 1997. No one contacted the winning teacher with the news that her class had won first place. Eventually, the school received a plaque and certificate in the mail, but the students were never publicly recognized.[14] According to Thor, "It [winning nationals] was great except we received almost no recognition from either CCE or NCSL. I found out on the news that we had won. I was never contacted by NCSL or CCE that we had won."[15]

Six months after the August 1997 national competition was held, Judy Carnine's sixth-grade Project Citizen class in Indiana received in the mail a large green ribbon with "Honorable Mention" printed on the front and a letter of congratulation. The letter did not say which portfolios placed ahead of hers, how many portfolios were in the competition, or why her class won an honorable mention. Some of the students guessed that every portfolio except the winner received an honorable mention.[16] Without feedback or detail, the award was fairly meaningless.

Barriers to Participating in a Competition

Many states face significant barriers that impede or prevent their students from actively participating in Project Citizen competitions, particularly in state competitions that include simulated hearings or presentations. Most Project Citizen classes mail in their portfolios to the state competition, but are unable to travel to the site of the competition due to financial considerations, liability issues, or a lack of time. The situation in Iowa is generally representative of the widespread nature of this barrier; there, for example, teachers must have approval for out-of-class time from school administrators.[17]

Project Citizen state coordinators in Wisconsin, Colorado, Iowa, California, Washington, Kansas, Indiana, Ohio, Montana, and Arizona cite a lack of funding for materials and transportation to the competition as principal barriers to class participation in Project Citizen. Indiana teachers also must come up with money for substitute teachers.[18] Arizona's state coordinator, Lynda Rando, once offered to pay for a bus when the school was unwilling to cover the travel costs for the class.[19] Alfred Block, the state coordinator for Wisconsin, supports oral competitions at the regional level but notes that they can only occur with a financial supplement to cover travel costs.[20] The state coordinator in Colorado, Barbara Miller, was forced to scale down the 1998 state competition due to a loss of funding.[21]

To overcome these obstacles, a few states are coming up with new approaches. For example, Hawaii is planning to have judges travel to the schools to view the portfolios.[22] Students all over Alaska will present and defend their portfolios via live videoconference before a panel of judges at one location.[23] In Alabama, Project Citizen teachers have gone to their PTA or have applied for grants for additional funding.[24]

Another potential barrier faced by teachers is scheduling. In many states, the spring competitions conflict with required standardized testing. Teachers must prepare their students for the spring tests and therefore are unable or unwilling to prepare for the Project Citizen competition as well. When Project Citizen runs up against spring proficiency testing in Ohio, the amount of class time spent on the program is reduced, and so teachers become discouraged from using Project Citizen.[25] California teachers generally agree that May or June competitions are too late in the school year because many other activities have already been planned. If Project Citizen competition is viewed as an additional burden by the teachers, instead of as a learning tool to enhance student skills and to increase test scores, then they are unlikely to have their students create a portfolio to send to the state competition.

Coordinators in California suggested that there is a feeling that teachers dislike the competitive aspects of Project Citizen.[26] If teachers do not feel they know how to help their students produce a winning portfolio, they may be intimidated by the state and national competitions. In addition, teachers can get discouraged if the judges do not come from diverse backgrounds or if the judges' definition of a good portfolio is a portfolio that follows the directions in the book most precisely. In Alabama's second year of using Project Citizen, teachers using the program continuously called the teacher of the previous year's winning class to find out how to prepare a winning portfolio for the judges.[27] Teachers in Pennsylvania prefer that the judges allow for creativity from the students when scoring the portfolios.[28]

To prevent teachers from receiving Project Citizen materials (i.e., student and teacher guides) but not producing a portfolio, the Georgia state coordinator requires each participating teacher to sign an agreement that his or her class will create a portfolio and send it to the state competition. The Colorado state coordinator, on the other hand, has made a serious effort to reduce the competitive atmosphere at the simulated hearings. By focusing on other activities—such as a welcome from a community politician or dignitary and a meeting with their legislators—students are less solely focused on winning the Project Citizen competition.[29]

An additional reason many Project Citizen teachers are not enthusiastic about having their classes enter competitions is that, by a considerable margin, they view competitions as having the lowest impact of the six Project Citizen program elements on student learning (see table 7.1). Only 31 percent of teachers who use Project Citizen rate competitions as impacting student learning "considerably" or "somewhat"; the other five elements each received a response between 54 percent and 79 percent in these two categories combined. Also worth noting is that 42 percent of the teachers responding to the question summarized in table 7.1 did not even give a rating to the competitions element; this non-response rate was higher than that of any other element in this question.[30]

Table 7.1
Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Project Citizen Program Elements on Student Learning

Program Element	Average Response
Working as a group	3.6
Researching the problem	3.5
Selecting the problem	3.4
Creating the portfolio	3.3
Presenting to an outside group	3.3
Participating in a competition	2.6

Source: LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Note: Average Response: 1=not at all, 2=a little, 3=somewhat, 4=considerably

Intended Outcomes

National and state Project Citizen competitions have several levels of intended outcomes. To begin with, the competitions are important to the students participating in Project Citizen. By providing the students with a goal, the competition raises the significance of their Project Citizen experience for them. For example, teachers in California enjoy the state competitions because their students grow excited, motivated, and proud of their work. The students like taking ownership of their projects and appreciate the opportunity to display their portfolio.[31]

The portfolios are a tangible result of students' hard work and thus serve as a means to assess their performance in Project Citizen. Students are able to experience a sense of completion and pride in their work when they are given the chance to send their portfolios to a competition for judging. When asked what they liked about Project Citizen, one Pennsylvania student responded, "going down [to the competition] and expressing our opinion."[32]

The simulated hearings are also viewed as a learning experience since they present participating students with the chance to articulate and defend their ideas, thus developing their speaking abilities and bolstering their confidence.[33] The state coordinator for Pennsylvania, Lon Weber, believes that simulated hearings at the national level would add depth to the learning experience and make the competition more memorable.[34] In addition, Iowa's state coordinator, Linda Martin, notes that the hearings can foster an atmosphere of information sharing and dialogue among the participants.[35] Lynda Rando, Arizona's state coordinator, strongly feels that the public speaking component of the hearings is critical and should be part of the national competition.[36]

The other major component of the state competition is the opportunity to promote the visibility of Project Citizen across the state. Holding competitions at the State Capitol and inviting state and local legislators to participate clearly raises awareness and potential interest in the program. The legislators are able to view firsthand the work of the students. Both the hearings and the displays of completed portfolios at the Capitol provide opportunities for key contributors of Project Citizen to see exactly what they are sponsoring and how it helps students learn about their government and community. Pamela Riley, North Carolina state coordinator, sees the importance of the portfolio and the competition as a basis for obtaining funding, because they present tangible evidence that Project Citizen works in her state.[37]

Not only does this increased awareness create the opportunity for political and financial support from the legislature, but a well-publicized competition also can serve to raise the interest of teachers and students who are likely candidates for using Project Citizen in the future. California state coordinator Roy Erickson believes that a greater emphasis on the simulated hearings will help to increase support for and use of Project Citizen by giving legislators, teachers, business representatives, and parents a chance to see how students are affected by the program.[38] The Ohio state coordinator, Libby Cupp, displays portfolios at the State Capitol to increase the visibility of Project Citizen and to encourage legislators to promote the program in their districts.[39]

Recommendations

The competition is an important component of Project Citizen for many reasons. At both state and national levels, competitions provide participating students with an important learning experience, reward their efforts and recognize their achievements, promote greater visibility of the program, and provide incentives to potential teachers and students for future use. As a student from Indiana noted, "The presentation is the best part. Having outsiders look at your work makes it seem more important."[40] Furthermore, it is important that students are recognized for their participation in competitions.

Thus it is critical that the competitions remain a central focus of Project Citizen for students and teachers. In order to ensure this, several steps should be taken by CCE, state coordinators, and participating teachers.

1. *Every student who participates in some type of competition, regardless of what honors are received by his or her class portfolio, should receive personal and public recognition by the Project Citizen state coordinator.* This should include some type of award students can take home with them—such as a certificate, plaque, photograph, or t-shirt—and recognition from the local state legislator. The state coordinator can take the lead in rewarding the individual students and getting the legislators involved. Another possible recognition a state coordinator might consider is providing a cash award to the winning classrooms in the state. The coordinators should seek funding for these recognitions from local civic associations, businesses, or individuals.

2. *Immediately following each national competition, CCE should provide every Project Citizen state coordinator who submits a state portfolio to the national competition general feedback on the competition, as well as a complete list of winners.* This list of winners also should go to every state coordinator. CCE should include stories about the national competition in its newsletter to state coordinators. In addition, CCE should directly contact, by phone and letter, the teachers who placed in the national competition to let them know the final results.

Final score sheets with complete information from the judges about each aspect of the portfolio should be made available to all participating teachers to help them prepare for the next year's competition. CCE should work with the state coordinators to ensure that all portfolios are promptly returned to the participating teachers.

3. *Project Citizen teachers need to understand clearly what judges look for in the competitions.* Some teachers have complained about the lack of clear direction in the current Project Citizen student and teacher books. For example, when Project Citizen is used in English as a second language classes, should the teacher correct grammatical errors on portfolios, or do judges expect that only students worked on the project? This could be remedied through a revised workbook or a supplement that more explicitly spells out what a final portfolio should look like and which criteria the judges should use when scoring the portfolios. The workbook could also promote student creativity by giving examples and by encouraging judges to take creative solutions into account.

4. *Project Citizen state coordinators should work with Project Citizen teachers and their principals to find funding for the students to attend state and national competitions.* This can be done through local PTAs, by applying for grants, or through state legislatures, school districts, or state departments of education. Teachers and students should understand that they are effective lobbyists and should work with their principals and state coordinators to meet with their state legislators, either at the Capitol or by inviting them to the schools, to promote Project Citizen. Parents should also attend the competitions and meet with their legislators to encourage future legislative support of Project Citizen.

5. *Project Citizen state coordinators should work with teachers to schedule competitions at convenient times to ensure that Project Citizen does not conflict with standardized testing or other programs or requirements of the schools.* The end of the school year is a very busy time for teachers, who often must make commitments far in advance. Scheduling state competitions at the end of the school year also means that some students who participate in Project Citizen during the spring term may leave for the summer without knowing who won. For those states that use Project Citizen in the fall, competitions could be held before Christmas, as is the case in Arizona, or regional competitions could be held throughout the state at different times. Other possibilities for accommodating teacher and school schedules are to have the judges go to the schools or have the competitions take place via live videoconferencing.

6. *Prior to each regional or state competition, the Project Citizen state coordinator should issue press releases alerting the local media to the time and date of the competition, as well as provide briefing material and model stories to the media so as to stimulate Project Citizen stories.* Another release recognizing the winners and summarizing the winning portfolio projects should be sent to the local press after the competition. Including state legislators or other well-known individuals in events increases the likelihood of media coverage. State coordinators should inform CCE and other state coordinators about these events as well. CCE should send stories and clippings regarding the national competition to the classrooms that participated, as well as to the appropriate state coordinators.

7. *State coordinators should develop some type of simulated public hearing for participating Project Citizen classrooms at state or local competitions.* State coordinators should work with CCE to encourage their state legislators to advocate the inclusion of simulated hearings during the national competition at the NCSL annual meeting.

Notes

[1] LBJ School Survey of State Coordinators, November 1997.

[2] Center for Civic Education, *We the People... Project Citizen Teacher's Guide* (Calabasas, Calif., 1996), p. 52.

[3] "Young People CAN Make a Difference - PROJECT CITIZEN Shows Them How!" Iowa Project Citizen State Coordinator's Office, Cedar Falls, Iowa, n.d. (Handout).

[4] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[5] Telephone interviews (conference call) by Brandon Atkinson with Chuck Canning, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 2; Jennie-Lynn Knox, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 4; and Dave Morris, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 3, Pennsylvania, February 26, 1998.

[6] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Gregg Donat, Judge, Tippecanoe County, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[7] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Jack Gaffney, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 10, San Diego, California, February 13, 1998.

[8] Canning et al. interviews.

[9] Center for Civic Education, "Arizona Class Wins 1997 Project Citizen National Finals," *Center Correspondent*, vol. 10, no. 1 (Fall 1997), pp. 1, 12; and e-mail interview by Anne Ray with Michael Fischer, Director, *We The People... Project Citizen*, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, March 31, 1998.

[10] Fischer interview.

[11] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Mike Miller, Project Citizen Teacher, Oak Hill Elementary, Lenoir, North Carolina, February 4, 1998.

[12] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Dan Prinzing, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boise, Idaho, October 14, 1997.

[13] Center for Civic Education, "*We The People... Project Citizen* Implementation, 1997-98" (Calabasas, Calif., September 1997) (Information handout).

[14] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Judy Carnine, Project Citizen Teacher, Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[17] Telephone interview by Brandi Stewart with Linda Martin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cedar Falls, Iowa, February 9, 1998.

[18] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Leila Meyerratken, Project Citizen Teacher, Tecumseh Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 20, 1998.

[19] Rando interview.

[20] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Alfred Block, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Franklin, Wisconsin, February 27, 1998.

[21] E-mail interview by Lisa Driskill with Barbara Miller, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boulder, Colorado, April 9, 1998.

[22] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Sharon Kaohi, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Hawaii, February 11, 1998.

[23] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Doug Phillips, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Anchorage, Alaska, February 11, 1998.

[24] Interview by Anne Ray with Shelly Chumley, Project Citizen Teacher, Bryan Elementary School, Morris, Alabama, February 21, 1998.

[25] Interview by Rachel Feit with Libby Cupp, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Lima, Ohio, January 29, 1998.

[26] Interview by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with Thomas Craven, Member of the California Project Citizen Advisory Committee and Attorney, Diepenbrook, Wolff, Plant, and Hannegan, Sacramento, California, February 10, 1998.

[27] Chumley interview.

[28] Canning et al. interviews.

[29] Telephone interview by Lisa Driskill with Barbara Miller, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boulder, Colorado, February 5, 1998.

[30] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[31] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Elmer Logans, Project Citizen Teacher, O'Farrell Community School, San Diego, California, February 12, 1998.

[32] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with students from Robert Allekotte's Project Citizen class, Amy at Martin School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 26, 1998.

[33] Miller interview.

[34] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Lon Weber, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, February 12, 1998.

[35] Martin interview.

[36] Rando interview.

[37] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina, January 14, 1998.

[38] Interview by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with Roy Erickson, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Sacramento, California, February 10, 1998.

[39] Cupp interview.

[40] Carnine interview.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

Students Push for Paychecks for Fire Department in Alabama

Students in Kay Ryan's eighth-grade class at Hewitt-Trussville Junior High in Trussville, Alabama, polled Trussville residents to identify pressing community problems for Project Citizen. After coming up with four policy issues—a leash law, pollution in the Cahaba River, an overpass at U.S. 11 and Deerfoot Parkway, and converting the volunteer fire department to paid positions—the students decided to focus on the fire department staff conversion. The class began by interviewing other municipalities and fire departments in their area. They compared this information to their population and the response time of fire trucks in their own community and presented their findings and recommendations to the town council. Eventually, the town council proceeded with a proposal which was already in the planning stages and adopted the students' plan. Today, the fire department in Trussville has a paid chief and staff! The students "realize they know more than some voters about how their city is running," said teacher Ryan. "Rather than reading about it, it's a chance to get their feet wet," observed former teacher Jan Cowin. "[Public policy] can be changed by the voice of the people," concluded a Hewitt-Trussville student.[1]

---

[1] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998; and Adam Rubin, "Junior High Class Gets Live Lesson at City Council," *Birmingham News* (December 11, 1996).

Chapter 8. Benefits to Students

The goal of Project Citizen is to develop students' commitment to active citizenship and governance. Project Citizen seeks to achieve its goal by providing students with the knowledge and skills needed to participate effectively in society and the practical experience designed to foster a sense of competence and efficacy. The program is also intended to develop students' understanding of the importance of citizen participation.[1]

In order to assess students' and teachers' perceptions of the benefits to students from participating in Project Citizen, project members conducted in-person interviews with students and teachers in ten states. Our research also is based on the analysis of Project Citizen surveys completed during 1997-98 by 381 students and 84 teachers, as well as student surveys administered in 20 Project Citizen classes in 1996-97.

This chapter, which describes findings drawn from these interviews and surveys, examines students' and teachers' perceptions about the benefits of Project Citizen for students participating in the program. No attempt is made to measure the impacts of Project Citizen on student learning, however.

Key Findings

Summary

Overall, our research shows students and teachers like using Project Citizen and believe it helps students learn valuable skills and information. Specifically, our assessment reveals that

1. students using Project Citizen believe they can make a difference in their communities;
2. students using Project Citizen *do* make a difference in their communities through Project Citizen;
3. students and teachers believe Project Citizen helps students develop a greater understanding of public policy, including the challenges facing policymakers;
4. students and teachers believe Project Citizen helps students learn how their government works and develops student commitment to active citizenship and governance;
5. students and teachers believe Project Citizen involves students in their communities and helps students learn about specific community problems;
6. students and teachers believe Project Citizen encourages students to work in groups;
7. students and teachers believe Project Citizen teaches students important communication skills;

8. students and teachers believe Project Citizen teaches students important research skills; and

9. students enjoy Project Citizen.

Our research reveals Project Citizen frequently introduces students to specific learning strategies, methods, and experiences for the first time. From conducting telephone interviews with adults to making oral presentations to outside groups to working cooperatively in teams, Project Citizen requires students to gain new skills and understanding.

Many Project Citizen classrooms go beyond the instructional components of Project Citizen. Students often not only propose a policy solution to a community problem, but also implement their proposal and successfully solve a problem in their community. Students in San Antonio, Texas, worked to have a sidewalk installed; a class in Leavenworth, Washington, helped create a student youth center; and students in Trussville, Alabama, helped establish a paid position for the Trussville fire chief. In these and other schools and communities, students are actually influencing public policy and learning firsthand how they can "work together to make our communities better."[2]

Students Using Project Citizen Believe They Can Make a Difference in Their Communities

"I learned that no matter how old you are, you can make a difference just by taking action."
Eighth-grader at Carden School of Fountain Valley in Fountain Valley, California.[3]

One of the most common reasons students cited for liking Project Citizen is it helps them "make a difference." Ninety percent of students surveyed believe Project Citizen helps them learn "how to help solve problems." Seventy-eight percent of students surveyed in 1996-97 "strongly agree" or "agree" that "I have discovered I can have an impact on my community" as a result of Project Citizen.[4] The surveyed students provided dozens of descriptions of the pride and enthusiasm they feel as a result of helping solve a problem in their community.

"I learned that kids are citizens also, and they could have an input on government and solving problems," observed a student at James Dobson School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.[5] "It gives kids a chance to do something meaningful," wrote a student at St. Croix Catholic School in Stillwater, Minnesota.[6] "I like that myself and my classmates can make a difference in my community," said a student at Franklin Township Middle School in Indianapolis, Indiana.[7]

"You can work in groups to stop a problem in your community," said a Madison Middle School sixth-grader in Phoenix, Arizona. "I like the idea of kids helping solve problems in their community and the idea of adults actually listening to them," agreed a Kyrene Centennial Middle School eighth-grader in Tempe, Arizona.

"It taught me that if I work for something I can achieve it," wrote a student at Hardin Northern Middle School in Dola, Ohio. A Dola classmate agreed. "It shows you how to work hard. How kids could do stuff and not just adults."[8]

Seventy-one percent of teachers surveyed agree Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "gain awareness of their potential to have an impact on their community."[9] For example, Project Citizen teaches "how we can change laws and regulations," said Robert Allekotte, a teacher at Amy at Martin School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.[10]

Seventy-seven percent of the surveyed teachers indicate Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "learn to apply solutions to problems," and 81 percent of teachers surveyed believe Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to *increase their* "knowledge of resources to solve problems."[11] Vicki Keck, a teacher at Madison Middle School in Groveport, Ohio, notes that after using Project Citizen "these students know where to go when they have a problem."[12]

Teachers cite various reasons for liking Project Citizen's approach to problem solving. Beneva Link, a teacher at Icicle River Middle School in Leavenworth, Washington, finds Project Citizen "allows kids to take the lead in problem solving because the students write the letters, call people and make presentations to community leaders to gather support for their project."[13]

One middle school teacher in Florida said she usually dreads teaching about the environment because kids feel so sad about environmental problems and frustrated that they can not solve them. She finds Project Citizen appealing because it can give students the chance to get out in their community, make a difference, and feel good about it.[14]

Norm Goldberg, a teacher at Wood Middle School in San Antonio, Texas, notes Project Citizen is better than community service projects that are labor intensive but sometimes provide no learning opportunities. He likes that Project Citizen often challenges students to define a problem, think about the problem, and propose solutions for it.[15]

Students Using Project Citizen Do Make a Difference in Their Communities through Project Citizen

> *"I liked the fact that now we know that kids can make a difference...and that we tried something as a group and accomplished it." Seventh-grader at Hardin Northern Middle School in Dola, Ohio, whose class successfully worked to have traffic lights installed in front of its school.*[16]

In San Antonio, Texas, students in Norm Goldberg's Project Citizen class at Wood Middle School identified the lack of sidewalks near their school as a safety hazard for children. While researching the problem, they learned the school district tried on several occasions over the previous 16 years to have the city install sidewalks. Undaunted, the students gathered data about the problem. They videotaped the dangers facing children walking in the area and interviewed the San Antonio Police Department safety officer, the Northeast Independent School District's police chief, and the city's director of transportation for more information. The class presented its findings to their local city councilman and the City of San Antonio's director of public works. As a result of the students' efforts, a sidewalk is scheduled to be installed in the summer of 1998. Goldberg summed up his students' accomplishments when he wrote, "Project Citizen works!! I know my students now understand the need for community service to solve problems and are empowered to take action!"[17]

Beneva Link's Project Citizen class at Icicle River Middle School in Leavenworth, Washington, identified the lack of opportunities for teens as a problem in the community. After researching the problem, students created a teen center. Once the center was established, students "contributed volunteer hours, and served on an advisory committee to continue their work," according to Link.[18]

When the Ku Klux Klan wanted to march in a town parade in Lafayette, Indiana, students in Leila Meyerratken's class at Tecumseh Middle School became concerned. To fight racism, the students, who were meeting as an after-school Project Citizen club, decided to develop relations with a school in Africa. Soon, students from Tecumseh Middle School and Azania High School in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, were corresponding back and forth, sending each other information and photos to learn about each other. Eventually, Meyerratken raised enough funds to visit Tanzania with three of her students. The Tecumseh Middle School students returned to Lafayette with photos of where they stayed, journal entries about their visit, and gifts from their hosts.[19]

Brad Calhoun, a teacher in Youngstown, Ohio, received a $2,500 grant to promote civic awareness and community volunteerism. He intends to use his grant to support a Project Citizen project on community awareness. The goal of the project, in addition to preparing a portfolio on community awareness in School Park Township, is to create and publish a booklet on the history of the township, with phone numbers to call when problems arise in the community. He hopes that he and his students can finish the booklets in time to distribute them at events scheduled to commemorate School Park Township's 200th anniversary.[20]

Students and Teachers Believe Project Citizen Helps Students Develop a Greater Understanding of Public Policy, Including the Challenges Facing Policymakers

> *"Being a decision maker is hard—you face people with a lot of different opinions and have to come up with something that everyone will support." Seventh-grader at Franklin Township Middle School in Indianapolis, Indiana.*[21]

According to the students and teachers surveyed, Project Citizen helps students understand public policy. Eighty-five percent of students surveyed indicate Project Citizen helps them learn "what public policies are"; furthermore, 79 percent of the students indicate Project Citizen teaches them to learn "how public policies are made."[22] Project Citizen student surveys compiled from 1996-97 indicate 84 percent of students "strongly agree" or "agree" they "learned how people participate in forming public policy" through Project Citizen.[23]

Eighty-six percent of the teachers who were surveyed believe that Project Citizen helps their students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "develop a greater understanding of public policy."[24] According to Alicia Otero, a teacher at Southwood Middle School in Miami, Florida, "Project Citizen taught my students to look at different solutions to problems and made them be more creative in order to solve problems within the parameters of reality. For example, some of the solutions they first thought of would have been too expensive."[25]

By tackling real problems, many students have the opportunity to learn firsthand the challenges that face policymakers. For example, at St. Croix Catholic School in Stillwater, Minnesota, students in a Project Citizen class decided to examine a controversial community problem. Their school's student body had grown so large that the students could no longer all be housed in their old school building. The St. Croix School Board was considering whether St. Croix Catholic School students should continue to attend St. Croix Catholic School full-time (this would require new facilities) or attend the local public school part-time (for physical education classes, band, orchestra, and sports). The issue was controversial in Stillwater, and many parents had strong feelings about whether their students should attend the local public school.

As the St. Croix students began to examine this issue, they discovered all the work and viewpoints that comprise public policymaking. One St. Croix student noted that, "It takes a lot of thinking and procedure, planning and many discussions." Another classmate observed that, "It is very hard to make one decision when there are so many choices." Another student concluded that, "It is harder than I thought it would be. We took it for granted that it would be simple."[26]

Students surveyed in other states make similar remarks about the challenges of public policymaking. "It takes a lot of hard work and time to get things for the city to be developed," said a student at Hewitt-Trussville Junior High in Trussville, Alabama. An Alabama classmate observed, "It takes a long time for something to happen."[27]

Maria Ramirez, a teacher at Ponce de Leon Middle School in Coral Gables, Florida, invited a lawyer to meet with her students to review the constitutionality of their Project Citizen proposals to help her students learn that there are limits in policymaking. The students originally developed a proposal to require mandatory fingerprinting of all school children to protect them from kidnapping. After meeting with the lawyer and learning that their plan could infringe on their constitutional rights, the students changed their proposal to offer voluntary fingerprinting for all elementary school students.[28]

Students and Teachers Believe Project Citizen Helps Students Learn How Their Government Works and Develops Student Commitment to Active Citizenship and Governance

> *"I have had students...come back and tell me how it changed their lives." Merrell Frankel, California middle school teacher.*[29]

The overwhelming majority of the Project Citizen students surveyed believe that it is important for people to vote in elections. It is important to vote because "we are the ones that are going to make the decisions," explained a student from New Hope Elementary School in Thornton, California.[30] "Originally, I thought voting wasn't important. Nobody even talked about it," said Suzanne Elementary School student Emily Zeller in Walnut, California, "[but] voting is like a major part of what America is."[31]

Whether or not Project Citizen increases students' support for the electoral process, students surveyed described ways in which they learned more about their role in society. Project Citizen student surveys compiled from the 1996-97 school year indicate that 72 percent of students "strongly agree" or "agree" that Project Citizen gave them a "better understanding about how my government works."[32] "We learned that you have to go to the meetings and propose things to the [city] council," said a student at Hewitt-Trussville Junior High in Trussville, Alabama.[33]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to a student at Hardin Northern Middle School in Dola, Ohio, "Project Citizen gave me a chance to learn more about our state and how the laws work."[34]

Seventy-six percent of teachers believe that Project Citizen helps their students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "gain a better understanding of government processes."[35] According to Janet Thor, a teacher at Kyrene Centennial Middle School in Tempe, Arizona, Project Citizen "involves students in the legislative process. They see hands-on how government operates."[36] Deanna Collins, a teacher at Monforton School in Bozeman, Montana, agrees that, "It involves the students in governmental actions. They can take an active part. Students have the opportunity to take action." "It helps to demonstrate the concept of federalism and how this plays out at the local level," wrote Linda Wymar, a teacher at Vermillion Middle School in Vermillion, South Dakota.[37]

Maria Ramirez, a teacher at Ponce de Leon Middle School in Miami, Florida, uses Project Citizen with her English as a second language (ESL) students. Many of her students recently immigrated to the United States, and she finds that Project Citizen is a good way to help them learn how the U.S. government works.[38]

Teachers surveyed believe that Project Citizen helps students understand their role in society. Eighty-six percent of teachers reported that Project Citizen helps their students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "gain an understanding of the responsibilities of citizens."[39]

Students and Teachers Believe Project Citizen Involves Students in Their Communities and Helps Students Learn about Specific Community Problems

> *"I learned a lot about how our city works and interesting facts about the place I live in." Ninth-grader at Marina High School in Huntington Beach, California.*

One of the answers provided most often by students who were asked "What do you like about Project Citizen?" was learning about a specific problem affecting their community. Students also indicated that they like going out into the community and interviewing people about public policy problems. Student surveys compiled from the 1996-97 school year reveal that 89 percent of students "strongly agree" or "agree" that they "learned more about my community's problems" and 72 percent "strongly agree" or "agree" that they have "become more aware of community groups interested in public policy" as a result of Project Citizen.[40]

"It was a chance to go around the community and learn more about it," wrote a ninth-grader at Marina High School in Huntington Beach, California. "[I liked] getting to know your community better and understanding how it works," wrote a Marina High School classmate.[41] "It allows kids to hear and understand the problems that are going on in their communities and other communities," noted a student at James Dobson Middle School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.[42]

Eighty-five percent of teachers surveyed agree that Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "learn more about community problems." Sixty-seven percent of teachers indicated that Project Citizen helps their students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "gain awareness of community groups."[43] According to Pam Luenz, a former Project Citizen teacher at Sunnyside Middle School in Lafayette, Indiana, "Not only do students discover things about their community, but they also are actively involved in investigating community problems, contacting people and groups related to that problem, and seeking solutions. Some students became involved in a summer volunteer leadership training session and have continued serving in the community as volunteers" as a result of Project Citizen.[44] "It really gets the students involved in looking at where in the community you can go to find information, how to actuate change," observed Susan Duffee, a teacher at Boone Middle School in Boone, Iowa.[45]

Pete Snetsinger, a teacher at Marina High School in Huntington Beach, California, involves local government officials in his students' projects. The Huntington Beach city manager, director of public works, and chief of police met with his classes. The Chief of Police, Ron Lowenberg, enjoys speaking to the students because it keeps him in touch with the needs of the community.[46] The students "were delighted that the community listened to them and helped them," observed Linda Wymar, a teacher at Vermillion Middle School in Vermillion, South Dakota.[47] "They learn to talk to adults and not be afraid," said Janet Thor about her students at Kyrene Centennial Middle School in Tempe, Arizona.[48]

The students' descriptions of the problems that they researched reveal a wide variety of topics and an enthusiasm about the information they learned and the insights they gained. "I learned that the problem is more serious than I thought. I also learned that the problem can be solved if everyone worked together to help *troubled juveniles*," wrote a Kyrene Centennial Middle School student in Tempe, Arizona.[49] "I learned that there is a huge problem with *pet overpopulation* in Gallatin County," noted a student at Monforton School in Bozeman, Montana.[50] "I learned a lot about *gang violence*. I learned that it can be solved if we work together. It is a very serious problem," said a seventh grader at Southwood Middle School in Miami, Florida.[51] "I learned that doing *drugs* gets you nowhere and that there are a lot of kids doing drugs and dying," a student at James Dobson Middle School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, wrote.[52] "I learned how important it is to help our community in *teen smoking*. Before, I did not really want to get involved, but now I have realized that I can make a difference," observed an eighth-grader at Carden School of Fountain Valley in Fountain Valley, California.[53]

Students and Teachers Believe Project Citizen Encourages Students to Work in Groups

"I learned that working together we accomplish more." Eighth-grader at New Hope Elementary School in Thornton, California.[54]

Working in groups is one of the answers cited most frequently by students asked "What did you like about Project Citizen?" Eighty-nine percent of students surveyed indicated that Project Citizen helps them "learn to work in groups."[55] Student surveys completed in 1996-97 reveal that 86 percent of students "strongly agree" or "agree" that Project Citizen taught them "how to be more cooperative with others in order to solve problems."[56] In many cases, Project Citizen provides the first opportunity for students to experience a group project.

Students like the positive aspects of teamwork and provide many descriptions of the benefits of working in groups. Students in Kay Ryan's class at Hewitt-Trussville Junior High in Trussville, Alabama, reported benefiting from working in teams. "The workload was split, and it was more fun," said one student. Another student observed that, "You have different people who are good at different things." One of their classmates noted, "You have a better chance of winning if you have a group instead of one."[57]

Students in classrooms in other states also identify the positive aspects of teamwork. "I learned that if you work together, you can accomplish anything," said a student at Groveport-Madison Middle School South in Groveport, Ohio.[58] "We all learned to cooperate and each person has to chip in to help," observed a Madison #1 Middle School student, Phoenix, Arizona. "What I like about Project Citizen is that we all work together as a team no matter what happens. You get to know new people and learn about yourself better," wrote a Kyrene Centennial Middle School student in Tempe, Arizona.[59]

Eighty-seven percent of teachers agree that Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to improve cooperative problem solving skills, and 71 percent believe that the group work element of Project Citizen impacts "considerably" or "somewhat" on student learning.[60] According to Julie McCall, a teacher at Madison #1 Middle School in Phoenix, Arizona, "The cooperative learning aspect was great. Students learned to work together even when they disagreed. I think one of the best aspects was that students who normally did not talk to each other were now talking to each other about the project and what they were doing." McCall continued, "I am very impressed with what happened with and among the kids as they worked on this. They have become a cohesive group."[61]

Elmer Logans, a teacher at O'Farrell Community School in San Diego, California, noted that students "learned how to work with people."[62] Christine Neimond, a teacher at Cedarbrook Middle School in Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, observed that Project Citizen "changed the way the class worked together. Kids who never used to talk to each other now have had a relationship and mutual respect. The class became much more interactive after using Project Citizen."[63]

At Bridge Creek School in Yukon, Oklahoma, teacher Mona West finds that Project Citizen allows everyone in her class to shine, from the students with "F's" to the students with "A's." Students whose talents are not computing or essay writing blossom and become very popular during this activity. During Project Citizen, she finds that, as a group, her students demonstrate artistic ability, interpersonal relationship skills, and other skills she is unaware they have.[64]

Students also learn about the challenges of working in groups. "Working in groups is fun, but requires patience," wrote a student at Franklin Township Middle School in Indianapolis, Indiana.[65] A student in Kay Ryan's class in Trussville, Alabama, observed that the hardest aspect of group projects is "not agreeing on everything." An Alabama classmate found that the hardest part is that "they may not like your ideas." "If one person doesn't work hard, the whole group suffers," wrote another Alabama classmate.[66] "My group was unproductive and kept goofing off," observed a ninth grader at Marina High School in Huntington Beach, California.[67]

Some students and teachers experience the "free rider" problem, where certain students count on others to do the work. "People don't help and get the same grade or better," according to an O'Farrell Community School student in San Diego, California.[68] To address the "free rider" problem, Judy Carnine, a Project Citizen teacher at Franklin Township Middle School in

Indianapolis, Indiana, uses an evaluation form that requires students to rate each other's performance. She finds that the students are honest and consistent in their evaluations.[69]

Students and Teachers Believe Project Citizen Teaches Students Important Communication Skills

"The presentation is the best part. Having outsiders look at your work makes it seem more important." Eighth-grade student at Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana.[70]

Project Citizen provides students the opportunity to develop important communication skills, such as conducting in-person and telephone interviews. Sixty-nine percent of students surveyed indicated that Project Citizen helps them learn "to conduct phone or in-person interviews."[71]

In many classes, Project Citizen introduces students to certain communication tools for the first time. Forty-six percent of students indicated that they conducted in-person or phone interviews for the first time through Project Citizen.[72]

Eighty-six percent of teachers surveyed agree that Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "improve communication skills."[73] Lou Ann Sampson, a teacher at Hardin Northern Middle School in Dola, Ohio, finds the greatest strength of Project Citizen is the communication skills her students gain through activities such as letter writing, interviewing, and making appointments.[74]

Project Citizen also provides students with the experience of making presentations to outside groups, including judges, attorneys, school board members, and other community leaders. Fifty-four percent of teachers reported that presenting to an outside group impacts student learning "considerably" or "somewhat."[75] For the first time, many students present their findings in a simulated hearing or similar exercise to outside judges.

"A student who might only speak four or five times a semester gets involved and ends up speaking a lot in preparation for hearings," observed Vicky Kreunen, a teacher at Alta Loma Elementary School in Peoria, Arizona.[76] Norm Goldberg, a teacher at Wood Middle School in San Antonio, Texas, found that by preparing presentations and speaking to local city officials, students strengthen their public speaking skills.[77] "It gave us experience in presenting projects to judges and people we don't know," wrote a student at Franklin Township Middle School in Indianapolis, Indiana.[78]

Students and Teachers Believe Project Citizen Teaches Students Important Research Skills

"It was fun to learn about our school and its policy." Seventh-grader at St. Croix Catholic School in Stillwater, Minnesota.[79]

Eighty-nine percent of students reported that Project Citizen helps them "learn how to gather information on public policies."[80] Eighty-one percent of teachers agree that Project Citizen helps students "considerably" or "somewhat" to "improve research skills." "Researching a community problem" was identified by 79 percent of surveyed teachers as impacting student learning "considerably" or "somewhat."[81] "It is a wonderful project for promoting community awareness, problem solving skills, group coordination, and higher order thinking skills as well as research skills," according to Dee Motz, a teacher at Sunnyside Middle School in Lafayette, Indiana.[82]

Students use various tools to research their public policy problems. For example, students at O'Farrell Community School in San Diego, California, developed a survey on issues related to teenage pregnancy. The students surveyed 200 of their fellow schoolmates and analyzed the results. In Pete Snetsinger's class at Marina High School in Huntington Beach, California, students learned how to retrieve information from the city clerk's office. Mike Miller's students at Oak Hill Elementary School in Lenoir, North Carolina, visited the mayor of Lenoir, the court system, and several daycare centers to research child care. Students at the Carden School of Fountain Valley in Fountain Valley, California, interpreted data from a survey conducted by the local school board for their class project.

The Internet is a tool that is commonly used by students to research public policy problems. For example, Project Citizen students in a public middle school in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, identified the lack of trees in a nearby park as a community problem. They discovered that it was the only area along I-95 without trees. Through the Internet, they learned about an organization that offers $5,000 grants for planting trees. The students proposed applying for the grant as their solution to the problem.[83]

Jerry Katz, the social studies curriculum director in Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, believes that Project Citizen builds students' analytical skills. He thinks this is important because new standardized tests have sections that test students' analytical thought processes.[84]

Some students dislike the research element of Project Citizen. According to a student at St. Croix Catholic School in Stillwater, Minnesota, "[I disliked] that you really need to get a bundle of information on your problem."[85] "I don't like how we had to ask for information," wrote an eighth-grader at New Hope Elementary School in Thornton, California."[86] "It's hard to get information from people," observed a student at Boone Middle School in Boone, Iowa.[87] A student at Hardin Northern Middle School in Dola, Ohio, wrote, "I didn't like when we wrote to some people, and they didn't take the time to write back."[88]

Students at New Hope Elementary School in Thornton, California, expressed frustration in collecting information about their topics. Initially, they did not know whom they should contact. Then, once they figured out whom to call, they had a hard time getting people to return their calls.[89] Vicki Keck, a teacher at Groveport-Madison Middle School South in Groveport, Ohio, worries that Project Citizen sets up students for disappointment when they write letters and make telephone calls. According to Keck, "Many people don't bother to acknowledge the students' letters or phone calls. It is discouraging for the teacher and students when this happens."[90]

Students Enjoy Project Citizen

"The kids love it." Janet Thor, teacher at Kyrene Centennial Middle School in Tempe, Arizona.[91]

One benefit of Project Citizen is clear from our research—students like the program very much. Again and again, teachers and students describe Project Citizen with enthusiasm and excitement.

The most common student answer to the survey question "What do you dislike about Project Citizen?" was "nothing." Student surveys also asked "How much did you like participating in Project Citizen?" Forty-six percent selected the highest possible ranking and indicated they liked Project Citizen "a lot." Thirty-three percent of the student respondents selected "somewhat," and only 17 percent indicated that they liked Project Citizen "a little" or "not at all."[92]

Among teachers surveyed, 83 percent of teachers who have used Project Citizen indicated that they would use Project Citizen again in their classrooms. According to Dee Motz, a teacher at Sunnyside Middle School in Lafayette, Indiana, Project Citizen "generates much enthusiasm, excitement and collaboration among students, so I really enjoyed watching them intently pursue their study."[93] Gail Huschle, a teacher at St. Croix Catholic School in Stillwater, Minnesota, agrees, noting "It's a great opportunity for the kids!"[94] Mona West, a teacher at Bridge Creek School in Yukon, Oklahoma, reports her class enjoyed Project Citizen so much they awarded her a plaque for letting them use Project Citizen![95]

Recommendations

Ninety-seven percent of the teachers surveyed for this project state Project Citizen is a good way to teach civic education. Our interviews and surveys with students and teachers affirm not only that teachers believe Project Citizen is an effective method of teaching students civics, but also that students and teachers believe it provides students with important skill-building opportunities and the firsthand experience of making a difference in their communities. The benefits to students of following a project from beginning to end, working in teams, telephoning adults and asking them questions, understanding the challenges of policymaking, learning research skills, presenting a proposal to an outside group, and actually making a difference in their community better are significant.

Despite the challenges of implementing Project Citizen described in previous chapters, the benefits to students associated with such valuable learning experiences make Project Citizen worthy of support by teachers, parents, community leaders, school boards, lawmakers, and, indeed, all citizens. Following are recommendations that should enhance even more these benefits.

1. *CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators should widely disseminate research findings that provide evidence of the overwhelmingly positive impressions of teachers and students regarding the program's benefits to students.* Currently, knowledge among parents, educators, legislators, and others about Project Citizen benefits to students is spotty at best. Greater appreciation for these benefits not only would enhance financial and political support for the program, but also could stimulate greater use of Project Citizen and other CCE programs that meet state and school district civics and government standards.

2. *Although Project Citizen is intended for and used primarily with middle school students, CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators should reaffirm to educators and school boards that the program is an important element of a civics education continuum.* For most effective student learning long-term, the civic education skills and content contained in

Project Citizen should build on a civics foundation begun during elementary school years and be further advanced and reaffirmed by civics curricula in the high school years.

3. *CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators should work with teachers to encourage students to go beyond "mock" advocacy of policy recommendations and actually attempt to implement their public policy proposals whenever possible.* The benefits to students of learning firsthand that a classroom of students can change its community are likely to outlast the benefits of simulated portfolio presentations. Such incorporation of policy implementation in the community as an extended component of Project Citizen is most feasible and likely if educators regard Project Citizen as a part of the civics education continuum in recommendation 2.

4. *Project Citizen state coordinators, working with teachers and principals in schools using the program, should monitor and publicize the outcomes of students' public policy recommendations after the completion of selected projects to assess their longer-term impact on local communities.* Since Project Citizen classes usually end with students presenting their proposed response to a public policy problem and then advancing to the next level of schooling without having the opportunity for follow-up, implementation tracking often is neglected. Yet this information about the long-term contributions of Project Citizen would be very useful to promote Project Citizen and to enhance its visibility and effectiveness.

5. *To assess more fully Project Citizen's impact on student learning and responsible citizenship, CCE should sponsor research that measures changes in students' civic attitudes, practices, and knowledge before and after using Project Citizen, as well as during their secondary and postsecondary years.* In addition, students who have used Project Citizen and students who have not should be surveyed periodically to assess their differences in civic attitudes, practices, and knowledge. Some of this research should await more comprehensive and more consistent implementation of Project Citizen.

Notes

[1] Center for Civic Education, *We the People... Project Citizen Teacher's Guide* (Calabasas, Calif., 1996), p. 7.

[2] Ibid.

[3] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[4] Project Citizen student surveys administered in 20 Project Citizen classes in Arizona, California, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia during the 1996-97 school year; collected by the Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, in 1997, and analyzed by the LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, during the 1997-98 school year.

[5] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[10] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, November 1997.

[11] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[12] Interview by Rachel Feit with Vicki Keck, Project Citizen Teacher, Groveport-Madison Middle School South, Groveport, Ohio, January 30, 1998.

[13] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Beneva Link, Project Citizen Teacher, Icicle River Middle School, Leavenworth, Washington, February 4, 1998.

[14] Interviews by Sarah Wheat with teachers attending a Project Citizen Teacher In-Service Workshop sponsored by Center for Civic Education and Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., Tampa, Florida, November 20, 1997.

[15] Telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Norm Goldberg, Project Citizen Teacher, Wood Middle School, San

Antonio, Texas, February 17, 1998.

[16] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[17] Fax to Pete Weber from Greg Brozeit, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, of a January 11, 1998, e-mail memorandum to Michael Fischer, Center for Civic Education, from Norm Goldberg, Project Citizen Teacher, Wood Middle School, San Antonio, Texas, January 30, 1998.

[18] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[19] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Leila Meyerratken, Project Citizen Teacher, Tecumseh Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 20, 1998.

[20] Telephone interview by Rachel Feit with Brad Calhoun, Project Citizen Teacher, Boardman Local, Youngstown, Ohio, January 21, 1998.

[21] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Project Citizen student Jeremy (last name unknown), Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[22] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[23] Project Citizen student surveys administered in 20 Project Citizen classes in Arizona, California, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia during the 1996-97 school year; collected by the Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, in 1997, and analyzed by the LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, during the 1997-98 school year.

[24] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[25] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Alicia Otero, Project Citizen Teacher, Southwood Middle School, Miami, Florida, February 12, 1998.

[26] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998; and interviews by Vivita Rozenbergs with students at St. Croix Catholic School, Stillwater, Minnesota, January 7, 1998.

[27] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[28] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Maria Ramirez, Project Citizen Teacher, Ponce de Leon Middle School, Coral Gables, Florida, February 12, 1998.

[29] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[30] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[31] "Students Lauded for Voting Project," *San Gabriel Valley Tribune* (May 28, 1997), pp. A1, A4.

[32] Project Citizen student surveys administered in 20 Project Citizen classes in Arizona, California, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia during the 1996-97 school year; collected by the Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, in 1997, and analyzed by the LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, during the 1997-98 school year.

[33] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[34] Ibid.

[35] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ramirez interview.

[39] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[40] Project Citizen student surveys administered in 20 Project Citizen classes in Arizona, California, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia during the 1996-97 school year; collected by the Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, in 1997, and analyzed by the LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, during the 1997-98 school year.

[41] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[42] Ibid.

[43] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[44] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Pam Luenz, former Project Citizen Teacher, Sunnyside Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[45] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[46] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Ron Lowenberg, Chief of Police, Huntington Beach, California, February 11, 1998.

[47] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[48] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[49] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Project Citizen student surveys administered in 20 Project Citizen classes in Arizona, California, Indiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia during the 1996-97 school year; collected by the Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, in 1997, and analyzed by the LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, during the 1997-98 school year.

[57] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[61] Interview by Writer Mott with Julie McCall, Project Citizen Teacher, Madison #1 Middle School, Phoenix, Arizona, December 3, 1998.

[62] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Elmer Logans, Project Citizen Teacher, O'Farrell Community School, San Diego, California, February 12, 1998.

[63] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Christine Neimond, Project Citizen Teacher, Cedarbrook Middle School, Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, February 25, 1998.

[64] Materials sent to Rachel Feit from Michael Fisher, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, that included comments by Mona West, Project Citizen Teacher, Bridge Creek School, Yukon, Oklahoma, May 1996, regarding her 1996 Project Citizen class.

[65] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Judy Carnine, Project Citizen Teacher, Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[70] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Project Citizen student Richelle (last name unknown). Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[71] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[72] Ibid.

[73] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[74] Interview by Rachel Feit with Lou Ann Sampson, Project Citizen Teacher, Hardin Northern Middle School, Dola, Ohio, January 29, 1998.

[75] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[76] Interview by Writer Mott with Vicky Kreunen, Project Citizen Teacher, Alta Loma Elementary School, Peoria, Arizona, December 3, 1997.

[77] Fax to Pete Weber from Greg Brozeit, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, of a January 11, 1998, e-

mail memorandum to Michael Fischer, Center for Civic Education, from Norm Goldberg, Project Citizen Teacher, *Wood Middle School, San Antonio, Texas, January 30, 1998.*

[78] LBL School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid.

[81] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Jean Bockenhauer, Project Citizen Teacher, Amy at Martin School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, February 26, 1998.

[84] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Jerry Katz, Social Studies Curriculum Director, Cedarbrook Middle School, Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, February 25, 1998.

[85] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Interview by Jody McCoy with Project Citizen students at New Hope Elementary School, Thornton, California, February 12, 1998.

[90] Keck interview

[91] Thor interview.

[92] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[93] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Dee Motz, Project Citizen Teacher, Sunnyside Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[94] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

[95] Materials sent to Rachel Feit from Michael Fisher, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, that included comments by Mona West, Project Citizen Teacher, Bridge Creek School, Yukon, Oklahoma, May 1996, regarding her 1996 Project Citizen class.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

Slower Cars Make the Streets Safer for Students in Ohio

By slowing speeding cars, students at Hardin Northern Middle School made their neighborhood in Dola, Ohio, safer through Project Citizen. Teachers Lou Ann Sampson and Gail Hoffman's sixth-grade class decided to tackle the problem of cars speeding past their school. First, some students stationed themselves along Route 81 and observed whether the cars followed signs instructing them to slow down in the school zone. "We learned that a lot of people did not follow the speed limit, 20 mph," wrote one of the students. Other students began writing letters to the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and local police departments. Kirk Slusher, ODOT District One Planning and Programs Administrator, visited Hardin Northern and discussed the students' project at their request. "What impressed me was, they continued to question what was best. They didn't automatically accept my recommendation, they kept asking questions," said Slusher. After ODOT agreed to install the new traffic signs, the students had a new challenge to face. ODOT would install the signs but would not cover the operating costs. Some of the students then took their case to members of the board of education and got support for their plan. The street signs with flashing lights were installed just before the 1997-98 school year. Teacher Gail Hoffman noted that the students' successes "wouldn't have been possible without community support." "We set a goal, and it was accomplished," concluded student Erica Flinn.[1]

---

[1] Jim Sabin, "Senate President Praises Work of HN [Hardin Northern] Student Activists," *Kenton Times* (December 9, 1997), pp. 1, 5.

Chapter 9. Financial and Political Support

Lack of financial and political support remains the greatest barrier to the widespread expansion of Project Citizen. Currently, CCE provides each state coordinator with a $500 stipend and ten free sets of Project Citizen classroom materials for teachers. With this support, the state coordinator is expected to raise supplemental funds, lobby the state legislature, organize and conduct teacher training sessions, recruit additional teachers to use Project Citizen, and set up a state competition. These expectations placed upon state coordinators by CCE are disproportionate to the limited financial support given to state coordinators by CCE.

Yet CCE has been successful in finding dedicated state coordinators to direct Project Citizen despite this lack of fiscal support. Many state coordinators have been able to lessen this fiscal shortfall by drawing on the financial, administrative, and political resources of the various organizations that employ them and other key state individuals and groups.

This chapter examines the roles and responsibilities of key individuals and groups in generating financial and political support for Project Citizen at the state level. It details different strategies that state coordinators use to increase the viability of and support for the program, possible funding sources for state Project Citizen support, and obstacles that state coordinators face in seeking financial and political support. Finally, the chapter recommends some steps that state coordinators might take to improve and maximize their ability to secure financial and political support for Project Citizen.

Roles and Responsibilities

Project Citizen State Coordinators

State and local Project Citizen activities within each state, including obtaining financial and political support, are the responsibility of the state coordinator. Obtaining financial support is one of the most essential and difficult tasks facing the state coordinators, especially when about 80 percent of them spend between one and five hours a week administering Project Citizen.[1] This does not leave the state coordinator much time to devise and implement a coordinated strategy for gaining support and funding from the state legislature or other state groups.

In addition, state coordinators are expected to develop implementation plans and take significant steps to increase the visibility of and political support for the program. Responsibility for publicizing Project Citizen statewide, as well as lobbying and developing relationships with key state political supporters, is relegated to state coordinators. In general, these efforts start and end with the state coordinator. Thus state coordinators need to seek out creative methods for securing funds and developing support networks so they can delegate some responsibility for this role to other members of the Project Citizen network.

Center for Civic Education

CCE's director for state government relations, Greg Brozeit, is the point person at CCE on fund-raising issues. His work within selected states is excellent but limited by his time constraints and his key involvement in working with congressional staff to increase federal support for CCE's *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program.

Brozeit describes his state government relations role as reactive rather than proactive, meaning that he does not generally initiate contacts with state legislators and their staffs; rather, he goes into a state when he is invited by a state coordinator looking for help in securing Project Citizen support.[2] In this capacity, Brozeit has been instrumental in working with a few state coordinators and legislators both to build a community of support for Project Citizen and to create support and sponsors for Project Citizen appropriations. For example, when the Nevada state coordinator received a call from the speaker of the house in the Nevada Legislature expressing his willingness to support Project Citizen legislation, Brozeit worked with the state coordinator and the speaker's staff to draft legislation and provide supplemental information and guidance regarding Project Citizen implementation in Nevada.[3] Brozeit played a similar, albeit a smaller, role in Arizona, where he met with key legislators whom Lynda Rando, Arizona state coordinator, had recruited as program supporters. He provided them with additional information about Project Citizen and the funding the program received in other states.[4]

National Conference of State Legislatures

In its state-based Project Citizen fund-raising efforts, CCE has relied on the support and sponsorship of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). However, NCSL's involvement has been limited to providing CCE with contact names and has yet to extend to helping state coordinators directly. NCSL provides contact names to Brozeit and nationally endorses and publicizes the program in its literature. NCSL official Karl Kurtz described NCSL's involvement with Project Citizen as follows:

> NCSL has had a strong interest in civic education for many years, growing out of concern for the poor public understanding and support of the legislative process. We have been able to provide them [CCE] with political and marketing support through our endorsement and partnership. We regularly promote Project Citizen to the legislatures, primarily through the NCSL Executive Committee members. We regularly report to them on Project Citizen activities and recruit legislator participants. We provide contact points and consult with the Center on states in which they are having difficulty in obtaining legislative support.[5]

NCSL is very instrumental to the state fund-raising efforts of CCE and state coordinators. However, CCE has yet to exploit fully this potential source of support. It is currently the responsibility of CCE to pass along to state coordinators the state contact names and leads provided by NCSL. In fact, NCSL provides contact names for every state, but CCE only passes on this information in a few cases. Many state coordinators expressed a desire to have more contact with the NCSL and remarked that NCSL's publications could provide guidance to CCE and the coordinators in creating a "how to" manual for seeking financial support from legislatures. CCE plans to coordinate the dissemination of this information better in the future, starting at the June 1998 state coordinators' meeting.[6] Thus NCSL's current direct relationship with CCE is likely to expand so there is more direct contact between state coordinators and representatives of NCSL within their respective states over the next few years.

Project Citizen Advisory Committees

In order to overcome their time constraints and increase their effectiveness, some state coordinators created Project Citizen Advisory Committees to help them achieve their fund-raising and political support goals. An advisory committee is essential to developing and implementing a coordinated state strategy for passing Project Citizen legislation. Advisory committee members may include state legislators, judges, attorneys, community leaders, business representatives, representatives from state departments of education, teachers, parents, and students.

Advisory committees ease the burden of state coordinators by drawing on the ideas and strengths of committee members. They also serve as a good starting point for creating a network of Project Citizen supporters in a state. The use of advisory committees is very helpful in devising a unified strategy to increase funding for the program. State coordinators in two states, Arizona and California, have developed advisory committees, and other coordinators are considering doing so. The Arizona advisory committee has been instrumental to the success of Project Citizen fund-raising efforts within that state, whereas the California committee is still in the developmental stage.

Project Citizen Teachers

Teachers are an extremely valuable and underutilized resource in state Project Citizen networks. Often teachers are the strongest advocates of the programs they teach. They represent a constituency that state coordinators need to draw on and organize. Teachers can provide success stories and other information to legislators about Project Citizen classrooms in their respective districts. In this way, the role of teachers is much larger than the classroom. Teachers are an essential part of the larger Project Citizen network and should be used to help increase state financial and political support for the program.

Teachers, too, have been involved in raising funds for the Project Citizen program. In Southern California, for example, teacher Pete Snetsinger combined Project Citizen with the local government projects of the Thomas Bros. Maps Educational Foundation.[7] By integrating these two programs, he received funding from the Thomas Brothers Maps Foundation, which he used to buy disposable cameras for his students to use when doing Project Citizen fieldwork.

In Indiana, Judy Carnine and Leila Meyerratken, two Project Citizen teachers, had their students generate donations (money and project materials) from community businesses.[8] Students called and wrote letters to businesses requesting donations. For example, one of Carnine's classes worked on recycling. The students hosted a newspaper recycling drive and got a local newspaper recycler to come and pick up the collected paper. Another class cleaned up the student courtyard at its school. Students obtained donations of bushes, plants, mulch, and other items for the project. Meyerratken's classes generated close to one million dollars in donations and in-kind contributions in an effort to raise money for a roller-skating rink that was part of the students' Project Citizen policy proposal.

Strategies to Build Program Support

Before state coordinators can secure funding and political support, they must increase the visibility of the program so that people see it as a success. Building a strong network of key supporters is a crucial first step toward securing public and private funding. State coordinators who already have regular contact with the legislature and are politically connected have an established network from which to build Project Citizen support. In contrast, those coordinators who have had little previous political experience may be intimidated or lack the "know how" to garner political support. This is an area in which the CCE could provide additional guidance. The CCE does not provide any literature or training to state coordinators on how to build political support; instead, state coordinators are left to their own devices.

Competitions and Simulated Hearings

State portfolio competitions and simulated hearings are one of the best means available to state coordinators for increasing the visibility of their respective Project Citizen programs and developing legislative and community support. Many state coordinators invite legislators, legislative staff, and community leaders to participate in the competitions as judges. Competitions provide legislators with firsthand experience with the program, which is essential for firming up legislative support.

Lynda Rando, Arizona state coordinator, believes that simulated hearings best demonstrate the strength of the Project Citizen program to legislators.

> Without the simulated hearings, it would be much more difficult to gain support from legislators who had no direct contact with the program. The best lobbying for the program is done when the legislators see the kids participating in the program. The program sells itself.[9]

Other states are hoping to use simulated hearings to bring legislators into the program. For example, Florida used legislative staff to judge the portfolio competition in 1995-96 and 1996-97, and the Florida state coordinator, Annette Boyd Pitts, is hoping to set up simulated hearings in Tallahassee for Project Citizen.[10] Thus state competitions provide a unique opportunity for state coordinators to involve legislators and community leaders personally in the program. Simulated hearings provide an even more conducive situation, since legislators can interact with students and see the outcomes of the project firsthand. In the words of Rando, when legislators participate in hearings, "[t]he program sells itself."[11]

Portfolio Displays

States that do not have simulated hearings can still use their competitions and the portfolios to increase visibility and support for the Project Citizen program. Many state coordinators have received approval from their respective state legislatures to display student portfolios at the state capitol. Coordinators can use the finished products to draw the attention of legislators. Maine, Idaho, Iowa, and Arizona are just a few of the states that currently house finished portfolios in their respective capitol buildings.

Conventions as Expanded Competitions

Some states modified their Project Citizen competitions to allow more dialogue between policymakers and students. Iowa, for example, modified its competition into a "convention" that provides students with the opportunity to make presentations to legislators and policy experts. Iowa convened its first convention on March 5, 1998.[12] This new format, like simulated hearings, provides legislators and students with the opportunity to have a dialogue about the public policy issue addressed by a Project Citizen class. This provides benefits beyond those that can be gleaned from solely judging or looking at a portfolio. The Iowa approach demonstrates an innovative approach for bringing legislators and community representatives into the program and solidifying political support.

Mailings

Marketing and outreach are another key means available to state coordinators for building a network of Project Citizen support. In Kentucky, for example, the Administrative Office of the Courts contacted all of the state's legislators via mail to introduce them to and solicit support for Project Citizen. The Administrative Office of the Courts plans to follow up this outreach effort by personally contacting every legislator whose house or senate district contains schools actively participating in the program.[13] This is a good model of how a state coordinator can begin to create a Project Citizen network.

Success Stories

Focusing on the strengths of the Project Citizen program, including its student benefits and outcomes, is an effective method available to state coordinators for building political support. For example, California plans to promote Project Citizen by highlighting the success of one class that has used Project Citizen and implemented its policy proposal. Laura Mastrangelo, a member of the California Project Citizen Advisory Committee, is trying to accomplish this by featuring Project Citizen in an interactive, televised town hall meeting. These televised meetings are a part of the LegiSchool Project, a forum designed to bring government officials and students together to discuss key issues and legislation.[14] While the LegiSchool program is specific to California, it is nationally important because it demonstrates an alternative method that other states could use for increasing the visibility of and publicity about the Project Citizen program.

The ability to mobilize political support for Project Citizen is not limited to the state coordinator; students and teachers also should play an integral role in this process. Often students who push to get their policy proposals enacted do the best lobbying for the program. In the course of a project, students often meet with legislators at the state or local level to advocate their policy plans. In Arizona, for example, students from Janet Thor's class, which won the August 1997 Project Citizen national competition, actively lobbied for changes in the school's sex education curriculum and in the process increased the visibility of and support for Project Citizen.

> [L]ast year's class [that won the national competition] went to the Kyrene School Board, on radio stations, and to Planned Parenthood trying to get their comprehensive sex and AIDS education program enacted in their school district. The School Board remains fairly skittish about this. But the students are still trying. They are meeting in January [1998] with the curriculum committee of the district.[15]

Class presentations to city and state officials are another important strategy for state coordinators to use to strengthen the political base of Project Citizen. In Texas, for example, Norm Goldberg's students from Wood Middle School successfully lobbied the San Antonio City Council to appropriate funds to build a sidewalk near the school.[16]

Thus the role of students and teachers is vital to garnering state political support for Project Citizen. State coordinators should draw upon and build upon Project Citizen success stories by working closely with the press and using all forms of media to disseminate information about the program.

Sources of Program Funding

Federal Appropriations

CCE is working to increase dramatically the level of financial support it provides to Project Citizen state coordinators over the next five years by securing additional federal funds. Brozeit believes CCE will be able to achieve this goal by adding a specific Project Citizen section within future *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* legislation.[17] This additional funding would be used as seed money to help state coordinators expand Project Citizen within states by providing larger stipends to coordinators and more free sets of Project Citizen books for teachers and students. The money also would help fund a national Project Citizen simulated hearing competition, which CCE would like to establish in the next five years.[18]

However, this federal focus on Project Citizen is short term. "We don't expect to ever fully fund PC with federal dollars, but we do have to give the state coordinators adequate resources to build the program so that they can attract state attention and funding," Michael Fischer, Director of Project Citizen for CCE, stressed.[19] Thus CCE's objective in securing additional federal funds is to help coordinators further establish the program in their states and to provide additional financial incentives to state coordinators to achieve this objective.

State Support

Since CCE is not seeking to fully fund Project Citizen with federal appropriations, the program will have to increase its financial support from within states if it is to grow substantially over the next few years. It is important to emphasize again that Project Citizen is uniquely a state and local program. The program is based on the principles of teaching students to be active and participatory citizens in their communities.

With that in mind, it is very important that CCE commit to expanding political and financial support for the program at state and local levels. CCE accepts this challenge and plans to help state coordinators target state legislatures after it strengthens the broad federal support for Project Citizen. In this sense, Project Citizen differs from other CCE programs such as *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. This sentiment was echoed by Arizona state coordinator Lynda Rando when she commented, "PC [Project Citizen], however, is not a congressional program. NCSL should be the organization that supports PC. Pressure should not be to find national funding but rather state funding."[20]

While some states, including Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Arizona, and Nevada, were successful in securing funds from their respective state legislatures, this was accomplished mostly on an *ad hoc* basis through the diligent work of state coordinators and, in some states, CCE. No uniform state-based Project Citizen fund-raising strategy was developed by CCE. Instead, state coordinators are expected to take the lead in devising strategies and developing means for garnering financial support.

CCE currently provides no training or materials to state coordinators to assist them in approaching state legislatures for support. In fact, table 4.3 shows that state coordinators rate the responsiveness of CCE low with respect to providing training and materials.[21] In addition, 15 state coordinators rank financial support as the most important support they need from CCE. Thus many state coordinators believe CCE has not provided them with enough resources or guidance to seek legislative appropriations, even though they view this need as one of their most important.

There are, however, many different approaches available to state coordinators for seeking state support for Project Citizen. Several of these used by one or more state coordinators are briefly profiled below.

NCSL Sponsorship of Project Citizen

NCSL endorsement of Project Citizen is an important selling point used by several state coordinators when soliciting state support. In fact, NCSL publications promoting the program resulted in interested legislators contacting state coordinators instead of vice versa. For example, Alfred Block, Wisconsin state coordinator, was contacted by three legislative staffers following the publication of an article about Project Citizen in an NCSL newsletter.[22] In this case, NCSL endorsement and support for the program was paramount in bringing about legislative support. A similar situation occurred in Nevada, where the speaker of the house for the Nevada Legislature contacted the Nevada state coordinator about funding Project Citizen after reading about the program in an NCSL newsletter. This initial contact ultimately led to the passage of a bill appropriating $30,000 for Project Citizen in Nevada.[23]

Project Citizen Advisory Committees

Another effective fund-raising strategy, employed in Arizona, is the use of a Project Citizen Advisory Committee. Rando, state coordinator for Arizona, created an advisory committee made up of state legislators, teachers, students, and other interested parties early in the 1997-98 school year. At the initial meeting, Senator Randall Gnant and Representative Herschella Horton, the two state legislators on the committee, expressed to Rando that they needed a better idea about the total support for the program in the state before they could seek financial support.[24] Rando sent out a statewide mailing to middle school teachers to determine the level of interest in the state. Rando was then able to report back to the advisory committee about the high level of interest in Project Citizen. This, in conjunction with their participation in Project Citizen simulated hearings, was instrumental in convincing Gnant and Horton to sponsor legislation.

The committee also devised a strategy for seeking funds. The members agreed that a separate bill would likely fail in the legislature. Legislators are skittish of funding separate programs like Project Citizen, because they feel they then will have to fund all such proposed programs. Thus the committee decided it would be more effective to seek line-item funding in the Arizona Department of Education budget. Attaching the program to such a major piece of legislation was deemed critical to any chance of success in Arizona.

Although Gnant and Horton initially advocated this line-item approach, subsequently they seized an opportunity to have the state Department of Education provide a $50,000 grant to the program without enacting formal legislation. The joint legislative budget committee formally supported this recommendation, and the $50,000 was provided for Project Citizen.[25]

Visits by Michael Fischer and Greg Brozeit from CCE with the Arizona Project Citizen Advisory Committee also helped increase support for the program, as Fischer and Brozeit were able to give the committee examples of other states' funding for the program and to paint a national picture of Project Citizen implementation. These examples helped to persuade Gnant and Horton to seek legislative funding for Project Citizen. Therefore advisory committees can be very effective means for bringing together a network of Project Citizen supporters and for coordinating efforts between CCE and the states.

Inclusion of Project Citizen in Major Appropriations Bills

Including Project Citizen as a part of a larger appropriations bill appears to be the most effective strategy for securing state funds. To date, Minnesota received the largest state appropriations for the program.[26] State Representative Mary Jo McGuire, Vice Chair of the Government Operations Committee, drafted the legislation and packaged Project Citizen with two other civic education initiatives, namely, *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Youth Summit. State Representative Steve Trimble, chairman of the Economic Development Finance Committee, then guided the legislation through the appropriations process. The state ultimately appropriated $60,000 during 1997-99 for Project Citizen.

Packaging the program with Youth Summit was critical to its final passage. Youth Summit is a widely successful high school citizenship program that has been used in Minnesota for four years and involves over 20 state legislators. Project Citizen was able, therefore, to ride the coattails of this program and secure support. NCSL sponsorship was also crucial for solidifying support within the Minnesota Legislature.[27] Thus state coordinators should be aware of such opportunities to build on the successes of other programs for youth; bills that contain multiple programs, especially ones that have been successful in the past, have a greater likelihood of being passed.

Fortunately, many states now have budget surpluses, which is freeing up funds for education and other programs. "Lawmakers in many states are negotiating budgets that include substantial increases in education spending in response to a strong economy. While it is too soon to know exactly where the numbers will come out, David Liebschutz, associate director of the Center for the Study of States in Albany [New York], estimated that state education spending would increase 5 percent to 7 percent in the next fiscal year."[28] Thus now is a uniquely advantageous time for CCE and state coordinators to develop strategic plans for garnering financial support from state legislators,

Linkages of Project Citizen to State Curriculum Standards

Another approach for gaining state support is to demonstrate the linkages between Project Citizen and state curriculum standards. An appeal to this approach is that a demonstration of such linkages makes it much easier to expand the program and secure funds from school districts to buy Project Citizen books. One school district in Pennsylvania now requires teachers to choose between using Project Citizen or a similar program.[29] Although it is still unclear whether most school districts or states would be open to such an approach, it does hold some promise, as many states are in the process of revamping their academic standards and curriculum guidelines. Project Citizen is a strong fit within the context of this reform, and so state coordinators should stay abreast of these changes and seek the creation of formal state civic standards when possible.

Matching and Leveraging Funds for Project Citizen

Yet another approach for securing state funds was used by Pennsylvania state coordinator Lon Weber. Weber leveraged private monies that he secured for the program to receive a $31,380 grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Education.[30] By demonstrating that he secured outside funding first, he was able to get a state grant. Thus, state departments of education are an option open to coordinators searching for state funds.

CCE views the potential of using matching funds as an important tool for expanding the program over the next five to ten years. If CCE is successful in increasing federal support for Project Citizen, it likely will have state coordinators seek matching funds from their respective state legislatures.[31] State legislators may be more inclined to provide partial or matching funds to support Project Citizen than to be the sole funder.

Private Industry and Foundation Grants

It is important that state coordinators not get so caught up in trying to secure state legislative funds that they neglect other potential sources of financial support. Grants and private donations play an integral role in Project Citizen's expansion and success in some states. Many community organizations and businesses support character and citizenship building activities. The one drawback to this type of funding is that it tends to be on a yearly basis and thus often is not as stable as legislative support.

Arizona has been very successful in gaining private funding for Project Citizen. Since the program's inception, Rando spearheaded efforts, through the legislature and lobbyists, to raise money for Project Citizen. The first year she went to Speaker of the House Mark Killian, who raised $8,000 for the program by calling on the support of organizations with which he had worked closely. Since then Rando had Lori Large, a lobbyist, go to other lobbyists to solicit support from the agencies or businesses they represent. Rando also sent fund-raising letters signed by State Representative Herschella Horton, who is a state legislator and a strong advocate of the program. Rando pointed out that this was most effective in garnering corporate support when Horton followed up the letters with phone calls. Thus the program was self-sustaining during its early years due to the strong fund-raising efforts of Rando.[32] Rando raised several thousand dollars so far in private and charitable donations to the program from such organizations as US West, Southwest Ambulance, the Salt River Project, and the Arizona Bankers Association, to name a few.[33] She also invited representatives from donating organizations to serve on the Arizona Project Citizen Advisory Committee.

Idaho state coordinator Dan Prinzing is trying to expand the program significantly with support from corporate sponsors. More specifically, Prinzing's "principal target will be placement [of Project Citizen books] in the Boise and Meridian districts [the two largest in the state] sponsored by the Albertsons Foundation."[34] This case, together with that of Arizona, illustrates the importance of state coordinators looking to alternative sources of funding outside of state government.

Grant applications have been a somewhat less successful means of obtaining support for Project Citizen, although coordinators in at least three states—Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Colorado—received private grants to support Project Citizen. Pennsylvania received a $6,000 grant from the Stuart Huston Charitable Trust to be used specifically to administer Project Citizen for the 1996-97 school year.[35] North Carolina and Colorado used grant money not specifically earmarked for Project Citizen to expand the program. North Carolina state coordinator Pamela Riley used some grant money that the organization she directs, the North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence, received to purchase 18 additional sets of Project Citizen workbooks.[36] The Colorado state coordinator used federal Youth for Justice funds to sponsor Project Citizen in 1996-97.[37] Coordinator Barbara Miller had to curtail the program substantially in 1997-98, however, when Youth for Justice funds were no longer available. Colorado's experience demonstrates the potential instability of grant funding; while grants are an important source of Project Citizen funding, they cannot be relied upon to sustain programs in the long term.

Grant funding poses other problems as well. There is no guarantee of receiving such support. Annette Boyd Pitts, Florida state coordinator, applied for several foundation grants to support Project Citizen during 1997-98, but her requests were not funded.[38] She is planning to reapply for grants this coming year, since the Florida Project Citizen program increased dramatically in size. Pitts trained 40 new teachers since first applying for the grants and believes that this expansion in the program's scope should increase the likelihood of receiving grant funds.

In summary, it is important that state coordinators look beyond their state legislatures and other sources of state support when trying to secure Project Citizen funds. Corporate donations and foundation grants provided key financial support in several states. Although both of these sources of funding tend to be year-to-year and often require state coordinators to reapply, they can provide critically important resources to cover the costs of Project Citizen implementation.

In-Kind Support

The importance of available in-kind contributions and administrative help cannot be overstated when CCE selects Project Citizen state coordinators. All of the activities described so far to gain financial and political support for the program take considerable time and effort; some require additional funds as well. The most successful state coordinators are those who already had a network of educators and legislators prior to their appointment by CCE and who could draw upon the administrative, financial, and political resources of their respective organizations to help promote the program. Organizations like law-related education centers, state bar associations, state departments of education, the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, and the Administrative Office of the Courts donated time, resources, and money that were vital to the success and growth of Project Citizen in many states. This support has been instrumental to the success of the program so far.

Obstacles to Program Support

State coordinators face several potential obstacles as they seek to generate financial and political support for Project Citizen from state legislatures and other possible funding sources.

Political Climate and Political Priorities

One of the most obvious obstacles is a state's political climate and political priorities. Many situations outside the control of state coordinators can hamper and stymie attempts to obtain financial and political support from state government sources. In Wisconsin, for example, the legislature is split 50-50 between Republicans and Democrats, which places it in a steady state of gridlock.[39] As a result, neither side is willing to compromise, and new initiatives have little chance of being passed. The Kansas Legislature is facing serious school funding issues, which has effectively eliminated any hope of gaining funds for Project Citizen in the near term.[40] Similarly, the Ohio Legislature was recently charged by the Ohio Supreme Court to develop a more equitable system of school funding.[41] The sole focus of the legislature in regard to education spending, therefore, is on the school financing process, and there is little chance of enacting Project Citizen funding in Ohio until this situation is resolved.

State coordinators must be politically astute and must bide their time until the political climate is ripe for Project Citizen legislation. Developing and working with an advisory committee is one of the best means available for state coordinators to survey the political environment and understand when and how to obtain the state support that is necessary for long-term Project Citizen effectiveness.

Lack of Legislative Support for Individual Programs

One obstacle cited by several state coordinators is the difficulty in gaining state legislative support for stand-alone programs. For example, Libby Cupp, state coordinator for Ohio, had trouble gaining legislative support for Project Citizen because several legislators believe that if they support one program like Project Citizen, they will have to support a thousand others.[42] Similar comments were echoed by state coordinators in many parts of the country. When facing an obstacle such as this, some states overcame it by including the target program proposal within a larger legislative proposal. For example, state coordinators can sometimes "hide" Project Citizen in larger appropriation bills. Other state coordinators gained legislative support by incorporating Project Citizen as a line item within a state's department of education budget.

Line-Item Vetoes

An inherent danger with the line-item approach to funding Project Citizen is that a single item is subject to the line-item veto power of the governor of some states. For example, South Carolina state coordinator Cindy Coker successfully got legislation funding Project Citizen passed by the South Carolina Legislature only to have the governor veto the program.[43] Thus, state coordinators should be aware of the possibility of vetoes in states where governors wield such power and should take steps in advance to lessen the likelihood of such vetoes. However, the South Carolina example appears to be an anomaly, and it should not dissuade other state coordinators from using line-item funding approaches. The inclusion of Project Citizen as a line item in an agency budget and the necessary efforts to gain political support for Project Citizen funding are often more effective than legislation supporting Project Citizen alone.

Competition from Other Civic Education Programs

The state coordinators for Iowa and Idaho both expressed concerns about expanding the Project Citizen program because of the strength and support of other well-established civic education programs within their respective states. However, Minnesota was able to use this to its advantage by packaging Project Citizen with a bill supporting two other popular civic education programs.

Experience Level of State Coordinators

Another obstacle to gaining state funding for Project Citizen can develop when CCE chooses state coordinators who lack political experience and contacts within the legislature and the broader political and education environment. These state coordinators often feel intimidated going to the legislature for support. That is why, if securing state funding is a primary goal, it is critical for CCE to select wisely its state coordinators by choosing individuals who have prior experience working with the legislature.

Newness of Project Citizen

An additional barrier to obtaining financial and political support for Project Citizen from legislatures and other key individuals in a state is the newness of the program. Often legislators want to know, and to have evidence that demonstrates, the level of demand for the program within a state. State coordinators, who are limited by the $500 budget and other time constraints, might have trouble determining the "need" for the program. This again illustrates the importance of choosing a state coordinator who can use the administrative support capabilities of the organization in which he or she is employed to send out mass mailings and use other marketing tools to determine teacher support for the program. State coordinators, therefore, need to have a strong sense of the demand for the program before advocating it to the legislature.

Recommendations

Project Citizen, if it is to expand substantially and become even more effective, must have strong, sustainable, and broad-based financial and political support, especially within the states.

Several Project Citizen state coordinators recognize the need to foster such a state-level support environment. Working with CCE, NCSL, state leaders, teachers, and others, coordinators are successfully implementing creative strategies for increasing the viability of and support for Project Citizen. They are obtaining supplemental funds for teacher outreach, teacher training, competitions, administrative support, and materials. They are building state networks of advocates able to assist in gaining the necessary political support for the program. But at the same time, other state coordinators, while strongly committed to Project Citizen, are uncertain how to foster the necessary program support environment.

Following are steps that should be taken by Project Citizen state coordinators and program supporters, including CCE, to create and sustain the necessary financial and political environments in all states.

1. *CCE should select and retain Project Citizen state coordinators who are willing and able to provide the necessary state leadership to achieve sustainable financial and political support.* A state coordinator should hold a position or have the experience that enables him or her to work effectively with the state legislature and with appropriate state political and education networks. This allows the state coordinator to draw on established networks when seeking financial support. Each state coordinator also should be willing and able both to work collaboratively with CCE to implement the program strategies needed to achieve the Project Citizen vision and to work independently at the state level to provide the necessary day-to-day leadership for program development.

2. *Each Project Citizen state coordinator should create a Project Citizen Advisory Committee composed of key state legislators, department of education officials, business leaders, attorneys, teachers, education advocates, community supporters, parents, and students.* Advisory committee members can help a state coordinator develop, implement, and assess statewide Project Citizen plans and priorities for increasing financial support and for creating legislative, corporate, school, and community networks of Project Citizen supporters. Advisory committees also play an important role in enhancing program effectiveness by easing burdens on state coordinators associated with program expansion and fund-raising. Coordinators should work with CCE, NCSL, and key state leaders to identify potential advisory committee members.

3. *Each state coordinator should foster the development of a state network of Project Citizen teachers (and their principals) to serve as a visible constituency for the program.* These educators are voters who can contact their state and local legislators about their enthusiastic support for Project Citizen and the benefits that accrue to students and communities from its use. They can encourage parents and students to voice their support for Project Citizen as well. CCE and NCSL, working with state coordinators, could develop an information packet (personalized for each state) to advise teachers, parents, and students how they could be advocates for Project Citizen. Such a packet could include a fact sheet on the program that

highlights successes in the state and sample letters for teachers, parents, and students to send their elected representatives, local civic groups, and state business leaders.

4. *CCE and NCSL should consider ways to involve NCSL to a greater extent in promoting Project Citizen in the states.* CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators should highlight the sponsorship of NCSL more when seeking financial and political support, given NCSL's status and credibility among legislators, legislative staff, and lobbyists. CCE and NCSL could explore ways in which to make NCSL materials on the basics of lawmaking and state government policymaking more readily available to Project Citizen coordinators and teachers. Coordinators would benefit from having more direct linkages with NCSL staff to facilitate the flow of materials and the names of key legislative contacts in their respective states.

5. *CCE and state coordinators should publicize Project Citizen success stories more broadly and more effectively.* Media stories and reports of students taking initiative and making a difference in their schools and communities increase the program's visibility and often lead directly to greater use of Project Citizen. Documentation of Project Citizen successes also is important when seeking financial and political support, especially from state legislatures. CCE should actively encourage state coordinators to share their successes with CCE and other state coordinators, because showing legislators, other funders, and parents what other states are doing successfully is an excellent way to garner attention and support.

6. *Project Citizen state coordinators should use competitions and simulated hearings to involve legislators and other potential funders and to build support for the program.* Competitions and hearings also are great opportunities to involve media and to increase program visibility. Displaying portfolios at the State Capitol can be an effective means of demonstrating student benefits and outcomes to potentially interested program supporters. Student portfolios also should be displayed regularly at state and local teacher and principal gatherings.

7. *CCE, working with NCSL, should foster training opportunities for Project Citizen state coordinators to strengthen their understanding of the processes by which state legislatures conduct their business and their skills in communicating with and generally influencing legislators and their staffs on program matters.* This training should include the drafting of legislative program language and sample letters to legislators, as well as the drafting of proposals seeking grant support. If coordinators are to be successful, CCE and NCSL should provide follow-up support for those who have questions or problems relating to legislative matters.

8. *Each state coordinator, with the assistance of the state's Project Citizen Advisory Committee and CCE, should produce and regularly update a plan for increasing Project Citizen financial and political support that is strategic, systematic, and creative.* With respect to the state legislature, the coordinator should consider alternative approaches of embedding Project Citizen funding within more comprehensive bills. The coordinator also should look outside the legislature for funding. Corporations, foundations, and community groups are a great potential source of funding and often are looking for philanthropic opportunities that benefit students and communities. In seeking grants and other funds, state coordinators should

explore partnerships with local colleges, nonprofit organizations, and other groups whose program interests complement those of CCE and Project Citizen.

9. *Project Citizen state coordinators should approach state legislatures and other potential financial and political supporters only when they are fully informed and prepared.* Before approaching legislators, for example, it is critical that a coordinator have a clear sense of the demand for and interest in Project Citizen within the state, as well as a strategy built on the reasons why legislators and others might support Project Citizen. Knowing which potential supporters have experience in the education sector is important, as are knowing the correlation between Project Citizen elements and state social studies standards, knowing which legislators are advocates of civic literacy and similar programs, and knowing which legislators represent districts in which Project Citizen is being taught.

Notes

[1] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[2] Interview by Writer Mott with Greg Brozeit, Director, State Government Relations, Center for Civic Education, Austin, Texas, April 14, 1998.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Greg Brozeit, Director, State Government Relations, Center for Civic Education, Phoenix, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[5] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Karl Kurtz, Director of State Services, National Conference of State Legislatures, Denver, Colorado, March 6, 1998.

[6] Brozeit interview, April 14, 1998.

[7] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Pete Snetsinger, Project Citizen Teacher, Marina High School, Huntington Beach, California, February 12, 1998.

[8] Interviews by Sarah Lowthian with Judy Carnine, Project Citizen Teacher, Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, and Leila Meyerratken, Project Citizen Teacher, Tecumseh Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 20, 1998.

[9] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[10] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tallahassee, Florida, February 10, 1998.

[11] Rando interview.

[12] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Linda Martin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cedar Falls, Iowa, October 7, 1997; interview by Brandi Stewart with Linda Martin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cedar Falls, Iowa, February 9, 1998.

[13] Tracey Sharpe, "*We the People... Project Citizen*: Kentucky Project Citizen Implementation Plan," Middlesboro, Kentucky, 1997.

[14] Interview by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with Laura Mastrangelo, Member of California Project Citizen Advisory Committee and Advocate, Murdoch, Walrath, and Holmes, Sacramento, California, February 10, 1998.

[15] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Janet Thor, Project Citizen Teacher, Kyrene Centennial Middle School, Tempe, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[16] Fax to Pete Weber from Greg Brozeit, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, of a January 11, 1998, e-mail memorandum sent to Michael Fisher, Center for Civic Education, from Norm Goldberg, Project Citizen Teacher, Wood Middle School, San Antonio, Texas, January 30, 1998.

[17] Brozeit interview, April 14, 1998.

[18] Ibid.

[19] E-mail interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Michael Fischer, Director, *We The People... Project Citizen*, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, March 25, 1998.

[20] Rando interview.

[21] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[22] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Alfred Block, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Franklin, Wisconsin, February 27, 1998.

[23] Brozeit interview, April 14, 1998.

[24] Rando interview.

[25] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, April 14, 1998; and e-mail correspondence to Writer Mott from Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, June 3, 1998.

[26] Interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Jennifer Bloom, Director, Minnesota Center for Community Legal Education, St. Paul, Minnesota, January 6, 1998.

[27] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997.

[28] Tamar Lewin, "States Appear Ready to Raise Their Spending on Education," *New York Times* (March 16, 1998), p. A1.

[29] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Lon Weber, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, February 12, 1998.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Brozeit interview, April 14, 1998.

[32] Rando interview.

[33] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997. Exact level of donations not given at request of donors.

[34] Letter from Dan Prinzing, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boise, Idaho, to Michael Fischer, Director, *We the People... Project Citizen*, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, August 25, 1997.

[35] Weber interview.

[36] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina, January 14, 1998.

[37] Telephone interviews by Lisa Driskill with Barbara Miller, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boulder, Colorado, October 14, 1997, and February 5, 1998.

[38] Pitts interview.

[39] Block interview.

[40] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Richard Leighty, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tecumseh, Kansas, February 17, 1998.

[41] Interview by Rachel Feit with Libby Cupp, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Lima, Ohio, January 29, 1998.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Interview by Suzie Meltz with Cindy Coker, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Columbia, South Carolina, October 3, 1997.

Project Citizen Student Success Story

North Carolina Class Calls for Clean-Up of Currituck Sound

In Maple, North Carolina, Judith Dempsey's class at Central Elementary School chose to examine the environmental problems in Currituck Sound. The students visited the Sound, took photos, conducted research, and interviewed a state legislator and a county commissioner to prepare their portfolio. "We learned that the water isn't as clear as it used to be. Pollution is in the Sound, there are not as many birds or fish as there used to be, and there is run-off from farms and septic tanks. There is also too much salt in the Sound," wrote a Central Elementary School student. Twelve of the students presented these findings and others to the county board of commissioners. The chairman noted that if the board members had been as concerned about Currituck Sound as these students when they were their age, the Sound would not be in the shape it is in today.[1]

---

[1] Phone interview by Beth McNeill with Judith Dempsey, Guidance Counselor, Central Elementary School, Maple, North Carolina, February 5, 1998; and LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

Chapter 10. Framework for Implementation

> Education in civics and government should not be incidental to the schooling of American youth, but a central purpose of education essential to the well-being of American constitutional democracy.[1]

The aim of civic education is to help individuals gain the civic competencies necessary to participate as informed and responsible citizens in influencing public policy in their neighborhoods and communities. While gaining the essential civic dispositions, knowledge skills, and participatory skills is a lifelong endeavor involving both formal and informal education, the education that occurs in and through middle and secondary schools is particularly important in shaping civic skills, values, reasoning, understanding, and involvement. Youth of that age are establishing the foundation for their participation or nonparticipation as citizens in our democratic society; they are learning the value of civic engagement and its importance both personally and societally—or beginning lives of apathy toward politics and distrust of government.

The middle school years are a particularly critical time to begin to engage students in the practice of citizenship through civic education. Youth at that age are exploring independence and their roles in their communities. They are struggling with their own sense of identity and purpose as well as with their interrelationships with peers and adults. They are growing up in a complex world from which withdrawal often seems a more attractive alternative than active voluntarism with peers to address community problems. What these students need is a civic education that balances learning with real world experience and classroom activities with community involvement, as well as excites students about the opportunities and challenges of responsible and informed citizenship.

Early Successes

CCE's Project Citizen is designed to provide such civic education during the middle school years. The program is aimed at actively encouraging civic participation among students, their parents, and members of their communities. Project Citizen seeks to help students develop their commitment to active citizenship by

1. "providing the knowledge and skills for effective participation";
2. "providing practical experience designed to foster a sense of competence and efficacy"; and
3. "developing an understanding of the importance of citizen participation."[2]

The American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project (AYCPP), which was the predecessor of Project Citizen, seems to have achieved these results. Teachers in the national pilot program (1993-94), which followed the California pilot program of AYCPP (1992-93), were overwhelmingly positive about the results, even though they had received no training in the curriculum's implementation: 97 percent reported they would recommend AYCPP to other teachers, and 92 percent reported they would want to participate again. Teachers' comments about benefits to students included:

1. "[s]tudents learn to deal with real life problems";
2. "[the program] challenges students and makes them more aware of their own abilities";
3. "[s]tudents from diverse backgrounds found the positive in each other and became friends";
4. "[t]he students became aware of their role in the community"; and
5. "[it] gives the students a feeling of empowerment with respect to government and decisionmaking."[3]

Students were similarly enthusiastic about their AYCPP participation, reporting that they

1. "developed a greater understanding of public policy" (98 percent);
2. "learned more about their community's problems" (97 percent);
3. "learned how to be more cooperative with others in order to solve problems" (88 percent); and
4. "improved their research skills" (92 percent).[4]

In 1995, after a hiatus due to lack of funding for materials and other administrative expenses, AYCPP was reborn as *We the People... Project Citizen* by CCE, in collaboration with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). In Project Citizen's first two years of (limited) implementation nationwide (1995-97), it seemed to be achieving positive results similar to those of AYCPP. Teachers and students who used Project Citizen were enthusiastic, as were community leaders and state legislators who became familiar with the program.

By fall 1997, CCE had appointed Project Citizen state coordinators in most states, and several were developing effective approaches to administering the program, informing and recruiting teachers, organizing teacher training, using the program in the classroom and community, conducting local and statewide competitions and hearings, and building networks of financial and political support. Although the numbers of participating teachers, classes, and students were difficult to calculate and most states had fewer than ten teachers who used the program at some point during 1995-97, there was growing interest and enthusiasm among teachers and other educators about Project Citizen's success in effecting improvement in students' learning skills and their civic understanding and participation.

At the same time, Project Citizen implementation was slow in several states. Although all Project Citizen (volunteer) state coordinators and teachers supported the program, some were having difficulty coping with the reported lack of materials, funding, administrative support, training, time, or communication. Also, CCE recognized the need to learn more systematically about the extent to which Project Citizen implementation was occurring, what program successes were being achieved with respect to each of the components of Project Citizen, what program concerns were inhibiting growth of the program, what approaches were being used to promote and publicize the program, and what benefits were students perceived to be receiving from Project Citizen.

These questions became the starting point for our assessment of Project Citizen implementation (see the evaluation plan in appendix C). The assessment focused on seven key areas relevant to successful implementation: state administration, recruiting and building support among teachers and administrators, teacher training, teacher and class use, competitions, benefits to students, and financial and political support. These areas are addressed in chapters 3 through 9, respectively; each of these chapters includes recommendations to strengthen Project Citizen with respect to that program area.

Yet successful national implementation and expansion of Project Citizen requires more than improving these seven program areas. What is needed is a framework that provides the foundation for increasing the effectiveness of Project Citizen implementation through the actions recommended in chapters 3 through 9. The following section highlights recommendations to create and sustain this framework.

Foundation for the Future

Project Citizen, while struggling, as all new instructional curricula do, for state, school district, school, and teacher adoption and use, has achieved significant teacher and student participation with minimal administrative support. The program's flexibility, coupled with CCE, Project Citizen state coordinator, and Project Citizen teacher creativity and commitment, has enabled the program to be used effectively in a variety of class settings and with diverse types of students. By the third year of implementation (1997-98), 45 states have state coordinators, some 450 teachers have used Project Citizen in more than 1,000 classes with 28,000 students, and 28 states held Project Citizen competitions in 1997-98.[5] Ninety-eight percent of Project Citizen teachers surveyed reported that the program is a good way to teach civic education, and 83 percent said they would use it again.[6]

Yet the implementation and expansion of Project Citizen should be guided by more than the numbers of states, teachers, classes, and students participating in the program. Building effectively on today's Project Citizen successes to achieve an even more successful program in the future requires a vision of where Project Citizen should be in five to ten years, as well as a supportive implementation framework.

Vision

A challenging, but appropriate, vision for Project Citizen five years from now would be a national program that includes classroom use in most, if not all, congressional districts in all states; fifty state competitions; a national competition that includes hearings and is widely recognized among state and national educator and legislator networks; and state-level financial and political support that ensures the program's long-term sustainability. A ten-year vision could be the growth of Project Citizen into a program as well-known and popular as the National

Spelling Bee. In addition, Project Citizen could be the middle school centerpiece of a CCE national campaign to increase civic literacy and civic participation through the establishment of state and local requirements for K-12 education in civics and government.

But despite CCE's exceptional leadership and commitment to quality civic education for middle school students, such a vision will not be achieved with the current approach to Project Citizen implementation. Achieving this vision requires that CCE take the lead, working in partnership with NCSL, state coordinators, teachers and other educators, state legislators and community leaders, and private businesses and foundations, to create an implementation framework for Project Citizen that supports future programmatic activities more strategically, actively, and collaboratively. This framework must reinforce and support the roles and responsibilities of state coordinators, on whose effective participation the success of Project Citizen depends, and provide a foundation for the program recommendations in chapters 3 through 9.

Recommendations

The following recommendations support the development of a sound, sustainable, and long-term programmatic framework for Project Citizen implementation.

Strategic Plan, Objectives, and Responsibilities

CCE should develop an annually updated Project Citizen strategic plan that clearly articulates short-term and long-term objectives to achieve the Project Citizen vision, identifies specific responsibilities and tasks required to accomplished these objectives, and addresses the generation and allocation of resources to carry out these tasks. The planning process should involve Project Citizen state coordinators in preparing, monitoring, assessing, and revising the plan and should reflect CCE's overall organizational vision, plans, and priorities. Particularly important in this process is agreement among CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators regarding their respective roles, responsibilities, and expectations, as well as those of NCSL, Project Citizen Advisory Committees, Project Citizen teachers, and other educators and policymakers.

Chapters 3 through 9 include specific recommendations consistent with CCE's vision for Project Citizen and focus on key issues associated with Project Citizen implementation. As part of the planning process, CCE, in collaboration with state coordinators, should assess these recommendations relative to its Project Citizen vision and develop a timetable for both short-term and long-term actions that should be taken to achieve Project Citizen objectives.

Table 10.1 illustrates possible Project Citizen roles and responsibilities for CCE, state coordinators, and other program participants, based on the recommendations in this report. CCE should provide state coordinators and others with this type of summary statement to ensure that all parties share expectations regarding the implementation of Project Citizen.

Program Leadership and Administration

A strong, effective Project Citizen program of the scope envisioned in five to ten years requires strong, effective program leadership and administration in CCE and in all states. In CCE, Project Citizen needs the full-time commitment of one or more staff persons responsible for

1. developing and updating a Project Citizen strategic plan that clearly articulates short-term and long-term programmatic objectives, as well as the specific steps to achieve these objectives;

2. communicating and promoting program goals to all parties involved in the implementation of Project Citizen, especially state coordinators;

3. developing and enhancing strong relationships with state coordinators to identify and address challenges and opportunities relative to Project Citizen expansion;

4. developing collateral Project Citizen material that Project Citizen state coordinators and teachers can use to carry out their responsibilities, including, but not limited to, state coordinator handbooks, teacher recruitment and outreach information, and teacher training materials;

5. promoting the Project Citizen vision, objectives, successes, and activities, including materials for state coordinators' use in their promotion of the program;

6. developing and implementing systems for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data and other information about the use of Project Citizen nationally and in the states; and

7. working with other CCE staff and NCSL staff to foster national and state support for Project Citizen.

As CCE recognizes, equally important to full implementation of Project Citizen are the state coordinators. They need to be entrepreneurs and problem solvers, able and willing to

1. generate the financial and political support at the state level to implement Project Citizen;

2. build and use networks of state educators, legislators, and other policymakers influencing the implementation of Project Citizen;

3. inform and recruit teachers and teacher trainers about the benefits and use of Project Citizen; and

4. provide overall state leadership and administrative support for Project Citizen.

CCE could use either of two approaches to ensure that Project Citizen state coordinators have the needed qualities and skills. In some cases, CCE has selected or may be able to select a state coordinator who already possesses them. However, this option often is not available, in which case CCE must be prepared to provide the training and support necessary to foster these qualities and skills. Examples of ways in which this could be accomplished include coordinator-specific personal development plans and training for coordinators, as well as through a mentoring system in which more experienced state coordinators are paired with those who are less experienced.

In both situations, CCE and coordinators should be in full agreement on their respective Project Citizen responsibilities and expectations. CCE should annually discuss with each state coordinator his or her Project Citizen contributions and activities during the past year, providing recognition and incentives as appropriate. CCE also should share information about professional development opportunities with all state coordinators, as well as such supplemental material as documentation on successful teacher outreach, recruitment, and training approaches; model letters for legislators and founders; sample press releases and other media guidance; and current contact information for other state coordinators.

If CCE continues to rely on a state-by-state volunteer network of Project Citizen coordinators to provide program leadership and administration, CCE should examine closely whether such a network is consistent with the extensive responsibilities that state coordinators need to assume if Project Citizen is to achieve its national and state objectives. CCE, for example, could consider selecting persons as state coordinators who work for organizations with programmatic visions and objectives common to those of Project Citizen (e.g., state departments of education, state law-related education organizations, education nonprofit groups).

Finally, CCE should explore the possibility of creating and working with a National Project Citizen Advisory Committee. Members of such a committee could include leading state legislators, representatives of education foundations and nonprofit groups, state coordinators, state department of education officials active in civics standards and curricula matters, policy researchers, and the like. This committee would provide CCE counsel and assistance in the development and implementation of its Project Citizen strategic plan, as well as work collaboratively with Project Citizen state coordinators and their respective Project Citizen Advisory Committees.

Communication Networks

Institution of a Project Citizen strategic planning process and the appropriate program leadership and administration capabilities within both the state coordinator network and CCE will not provide the necessary framework for successful Project Citizen implementation unless there also exist communication networks among Project Citizen participants. A culture of collaboration and communication should should be fostered among CCE, state coordinators, and teachers. These parties should, for example, not only be able to communicate inexpensively, reliably, and regularly with each other by e-mail, listservs, and other electronic means, but also jointly develop and implement ways in which each party could meet the Project Citizen needs of the other.

There are no effective Project Citizen communication and support networks now. Communication between CCE and Project Citizen state coordinators occurs on an *ad hoc* and limited basis. Project Citizen teachers have no effective method to communicate regularly with other Project Citizen teachers about classroom use of Project Citizen or competition issues. State coordinators may not even know the coordinators in other states, let alone be encouraged and able to draw on each other's implementation experiences, to share program successes and concerns, and to brainstorm with each other about such shared challenges as fund-raising.

Implementation of CCE-coordinator communication networks, while not overly difficult, requires a commitment on the part of CCE to ensure that state coordinators have and use their communication capability and that CCE has the appropriate computing capability to send and receive information from all coordinators. Implementation of a coordinator-teacher network in each state also is not difficult, but it does require leadership by the coordinator to initiate it and support its use.

Communication networks are also support networks and information sharing networks. They create electronic communities that share ideas and information; provide guidance on exemplary practices as well as promising teacher recruitment approaches and effective teacher training materials; encourage mentoring and the sharing of lesson plans and teaching strategies; and facilitate collaborative initiatives to build financial and political support.

One key to the success of these networks is consistent and frequent communication targeted specifically to Project Citizen, not to the full range of CCE programs. Another is simplicity and ease of use. In reality, the kinds of networks envisioned here are simply various forms of e-mail connectivity via the Internet. What is important is not the sophistication of the equipment or the operating systems but the willingness and ability of all CCE staff, state coordinators, and teachers to use such systems.

More traditional forms of written communication (e.g., monthly letters from CCE to state coordinators, monthly letters from coordinators to Project Citizen teachers in their respective states) also continue to be important to create the framework for implementation of Project Citizen. Whatever the form, however, its focus should be consistently and unambiguously on Project Citizen to foster the support and advocacy community that is needed to achieve the program's vision.

Publicity and Recognition

A framework for implementation of Project Citizen can incorporate strategic planning, administrative capability, and communication networks and still not be effective if it lacks the capability to connect successfully with individuals and groups outside the Project Citizen community. CCE should work with state coordinators to raise substantially the visibility level of Project Citizen both nationally and in the states. Publicity about Project Citizen and recognition of teacher and student participants in the program should be more comprehensive, continual, and consistent. Project Citizen needs a clear identity in the eyes of the media and the public; attention should be given to reinforcing its distinction from *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, while at the same time recognizing the symbiotic relationships between the two programs.

In addition to emphasizing Project Citizen benefits to students, CCE, together with state coordinators and teachers, should explore ways to publicize and recognize Project Citizen benefits to communities—and hence to all citizens. National and state Project Citizen Advisory Committees could be helpful in this regard. This emphasis also is critically important to build the state financial and political support necessary for Project Citizen to realize its full potential.

Research and Data

Despite the fact that Project Citizen is a new program and that few studies of its effectiveness exist, our research clearly suggests that Project Citizen has a positive effect on the development of student civic understanding, skills, and participation as well as on the improvement of communication, research, problem solving, teamwork, and critical thinking. Nevertheless, CCE should explore the possibility, in collaboration with potential funders, of initiating additional research on Project Citizen. Longitudinal studies of Project Citizen could provide insights into the impacts and benefits of Project Citizen on students, teachers, communities, schools, and other affected parties. Comparative studies looking at Project Citizen and non-Project Citizen classes having similar characteristics could offer insights into program effectiveness and benefits. CCE and state coordinators also should identify exemplary Project Citizen approaches and methods as judged by the enthusiasm of students, teachers, and communities and examine their impacts and broader applicability.

Reliable, consistent, and complete data on Project Citizen implementation are necessary for improving the quality of Project Citizen strategic planning and program implementation by CCE, state coordinators, and teachers. CCE and state coordinators should jointly develop brief, non-burdensome data collection forms on which state coordinators could report Project Citizen implementation information to CCE. State coordinators also should work with their respective Project Citizen Advisory Committees and Project Citizen teachers to identify information that could be collected from teachers to facilitate effective program implementation.

Conclusion

CCE has shown leadership in developing and sustaining Project Citizen with limited resources and volunteer state coordinators. Our research identified many success stories, and the program continues to expand and be warmly received by teachers, students, and communities.

The challenge now—and it is a substantial challenge—is to move Project Citizen from what is essentially still a pilot program in many states to full implementation in all congressional districts and then to achievement of the program vision. This challenge requires that CCE address the implementation framework recommendations that provide the infrastructure for improving and expanding Project Citizen generally, as well as the recommendations for improving the elements of Project Citizen (see chapters 3 through 9).

A key premise underlying these complementary recommendations is that they are mutually reinforcing and must be considered collectively. Implementing only one or two is unlikely to have a significant long-term effect on the effectiveness of Project Citizen. The challenge facing CCE and its Project Citizen collaborators is to refine these recommendations in view of middle school civic education challenges and opportunities and to make a sustained and collective commitment to their implementation.

Table 10.1
Project Citizen Roles and Responsibilities

NATIONAL	*STATE*	*LOCAL*
CENTER FOR CIVIC EDUCATION	**PROJECT CITIZEN STATE COORDINATOR**	**TEACHERS**
• Create long-term implementation plan ("vision") • Develop an on-line communication network that links state coordinators • Develop a comprehensive manual for state coordinators that includes training information, example fund-raising letters, and other guides for statewide implementation • Develop mutually agreed upon expectations and roles for state coordinators • Provide on-call technical assistance to state coordinators • Pair up less-experienced state coordinators with those with more administrative experience (mentoring program) • Develop a training video for teachers • Create, distribute newsletter to state coordinators with current events, success stories, contact information • Host annual conferences and training sessions for state coordinators • Host summer Teacher Training Institute	• Disseminate program text and informational materials • Recruit and train teachers • Create a database of teachers recruited to use the program • Maintain regular contact with teachers after trainings (follow-up) • Create assessment tools to evaluate trainings and competitions • Provide technical assistance to teachers • Facilitate the development of a teacher network or support group so teachers can contact each other with specific classroom related questions • Emphasize and explore links between state curriculum standards and Project Citizen text • Organize and conduct state competition and simulated hearings • Provide a rubric on portfolio judging to teachers • Recognize every student who participates in the competition with a plaque, certificate, etc. • Invite legislators and community leaders to judge and participate in simulated hearings and competitions	• Implement Project Citizen in classroom • Bring in community leaders to discuss policy issues with class • Be prepared to handle "sensitive" portfolio topics if they arise • Update state coordinator about experiences (challenges, successes) • Reach out to community for support • Organize class to participate in competition and simulated hearings **SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS** • Support teachers who implement Project Citizen • Provide funding for project materials, costs associated with competition • Support the development of comprehensive civic education curriculum and standards

NATIONAL Cont.

CENTER FOR CIVIC EDUCATION Cont.

- Provide supplemental teaching guides to educators and update and revise the manual as needed
- Recognize all students and classes participating in national competition
- Evaluate implementation and conduct further studies on the effects of the program on students and student attitudes

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

- Publicize and highlight the program to state legislators
- Distribute NCSL guidebooks on state legislatures and the legislative process to teachers and coordinators
- Provide legislative contact names to CCE

STATE Cont.

PROJECT CITIZEN STATE COORDINATOR Cont.

- Work with the press to increase awareness about the program, publicize the competition, and highlight student involvement within communities
- Generate financial and political support at the state level
- Develop a state budget and a detailed implementation plan
- Organize Advisory Committee of key Project Citizen supporters
- Build a network of political support among state legislators, local and state government agencies, community-based organizations, the education community, and other civic-minded individuals.

STATE PROJECT CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES

- Advise state coordinator on implementation
- Aid state coordinator in programmatic implementation
- Develop and implement a strategic fund-raising plan
- Tap into community resources

LOCAL Cont.

STUDENTS

- Conduct in-depth research on a given policy problem
- Seek to implement policies developed within portfolio
- Present portfolio to community leaders
- Serve on state advisory committees

Notes

[1] Center for Civic Education, "Center Launches National Civic Education Program Campaign," *Center Correspondent*, vol. 10, no. 2 (Winter 1998), p. 2.

[2] Center for Civic Education, *We the People... Project Citizen Teacher's Guide* (Calabasas, Calif., 1996), p. 7.

[3] Center for Civic Education, "American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project National Field Test: Preliminary Evaluation Results" (Calabasas, Calif., 1994), pp. 1-2 (Information handout).

[4] Ibid., pp. 2, 5.

[5] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, November 1997; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998; and individual interviews by project members with Project Citizen state coordinators, October 1997-May 1998.

[6] LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998.

Appendix A. Project Citizen State Summaries: Spring 1998[1]

ALABAMA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Wade Black, Associate Director	
Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education 800 Lakeshore Drive Birmingham, AL 35229	
Phone: 205-870-2433	Fax: 205-870-2459
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in Alabama during the 1996-97 school year. During the pilot year, about 15 classes participated with roughly 400 students. The winner of the state competition for that year went on to compete at the national level and ended up taking second place at the NCSL conference in Philadelphia.

For the 1997-98 school year, eight new sites were added but not all of them were active due to extenuating circumstances. Teachers in Alabama faced major schedule changes, system changes, and standardized testing, which caused them to revise their lesson plans and in many cases put Project Citizen on hold for a year. Fifteen teachers used Project Citizen in 1997-98. An estimated thirty-five teachers have been trained to date in Alabama. The state coordinator is optimistic that more teachers will use Project Citizen during the 1998-99 school year and it will continue to be a strong and popular program in Alabama.[2]

Alabama's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	35	15	May	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Wade Black. Black, the Associate Director for the Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education (ACLCE), has worked with the Center for Civic Education for years and took over Project Citizen in Alabama in October 1996. He is also involved in *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Civitas. ACLCE staff pitches in to help, but since ACLCE is understaffed, no one is paid specifically to work on Project Citizen aside from Black.[1]

---

[1] In addition to the interviews and the sources cited in the state summaries that follow, common sources for the summaries include LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, November 1997; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen State Coordinators, December 1997; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Teachers, January 1998; LBJ School Survey of Project Citizen Students, January 1998.

[2] Interview by Anne Ray with Wade Black, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Birmingham, Alabama, February 18, 1998.

Wade Black and the Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education are responsible for marketing and outreach. Conferences put on by ACLCE are effective for recruiting teachers for Project Citizen. ACLCE's annual state Law-Related Education conference held in February and the Youth Summit conference held in May both are successful in recruiting teachers. At these conferences, teachers are introduced to Project Citizen in break-out sessions. Completed portfolios are displayed and books are distributed to interested teachers. Teachers are also encouraged to call ACLCE for more information and materials. ACLCE also conducts *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* training sessions in every congressional district across the state and uses that opportunity to introduce teachers to Project Citizen.[2]

Training takes place during ACLCE state conferences and during *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* training sessions and workshops. Approximately 35 teachers have been trained to use Project Citizen in Alabama. The main presenters are Wade Black and Jan Cowin of ACLCE. Several other teachers have also been trained as trainers and give presentations on Project Citizen at workshops throughout the year. Other workshops, site visits, and phone walk-throughs are available for teachers throughout the year. There are other separate training sessions that take place around the state that are not directly connected to ACLCE.[3]

Project Citizen portfolios are judged in Birmingham every spring. The second annual state competition will be held in May 1998. Close to 18 classes participated in the first competition held in the spring of 1997. The winning classroom's portfolio won second place at the national competition in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

ACLCE organizes the state competition and recruits community activists to judge the portfolios. Generally, there is a panel of three judges for every five portfolios. The judges are given a score sheet and rank the portfolios on a scale from one to five. The scores are then tallied to determine the winner.

Past judges have included a police officer, the executive director of a local foundation, and the director of the volunteer office for student services at a local university. The judges are not paid but are provided with lunch from ACLCE. Every portfolio is displayed at the awards ceremony held at a mall in Birmingham, usually on a Saturday afternoon so students can attend if they choose. The winners are announced and every class that participates receives a plaque of recognition. Before the ceremony, a press release is sent out to local papers and a memo is sent to every Project Citizen teacher so they can tell their students about the ceremony.[4]

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

ACLCE receives a state appropriation of $10,000, some of which goes to Project Citizen. The Center for Civic Education also provides $500 for teacher training. Project Citizen had a line item in the state budget last year, but no longer does. More important than a line item appropriation for Project Citizen is an increase in the overall budget for ACLCE education programs. In addition, teachers must use their own discretionary funding for activities and materials. This does create a burden for teachers but has not seemed to prevent any dedicated teacher from successfully using Project Citizen and producing a portfolio. The Center for Civic Education also provides more book sets for teachers, which is helpful.[1]

---

[1] Ibid.

ALASKA

State Coordinator Contact Information
Doug Phillips, Social Studies Program Coordinator
Anchorage School District
P.O. Box 196614
Anchorage, AK 99519-6614
Phone: 907-269-2210 Fax: 907-269-2325
E-Mail: phillips_doug@msmail.asd.k12.ak.us

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was introduced to Alaska in 1996-97. Two classes finished portfolios that year. Two teachers are using Project Citizen in 1997-98. The state coordinator has not held a competition. Alaska receives no funding for Project Citizen other than the $500 stipend allocated by the Center for Civic Education.[1]

Alaska's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	3	2	None	No	No	No	No

Alaska state coordinator Doug Phillips is building a network of support for Project Citizen coordination. Phillips is the state coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and is an Anchorage Social Studies Curriculum Specialist, both of which have assisted this effort. He tries to find teachers who will "take on the cause" and then concentrates on building their leadership role. Presently, he is nurturing two teachers whom he hopes will become *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen state coordinators, respectively, when he leaves the state in the coming year.

Phillips is responsible for teacher recruitment and outreach. He targets innovative teachers. He originally focused his efforts in Anchorage. He has recently introduced Project Citizen to teachers in Fairbanks, Juneau, and Kenia. Mr. Phillips believes having one-on-one conversations with teachers is the most effective outreach strategy. He also encourages potential teachers to visit a class that is using Project Citizen. His job brings him to social studies conferences all over the state. He uses these opportunities to promote the program. Project Citizen fits well with Alaska's educational standards.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Doug Phillips, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Anchorage, Alaska, February 11, 1998.

There are no formal teacher training sessions. The state coordinator ensures that the teachers using Project Citizen know he is a resource for them. Teachers have called him in the past for technical assistance.

There have been no competitions or hearings for Project Citizen in Alaska.

There is no direct financial support for Project Citizen in Alaska, aside from the $500 stipend from the Center for Civic Education. To date, one state senator has approached Phillips about writing legislation to fund Project Citizen, but no action has been taken. The senator found out about Project Citizen from a letter from the Center for Civic Education.

ARIZONA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Lynda Rando, Director, Center for Law-Related Education	
Arizona Bar Foundation 111 West Monroe, Suite 1800 Phoenix, AZ 85003-1742	
Phone: 602-340-7360	Fax: 602-271-4930
E-Mail: rando.l@azbar.org	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first piloted in Arizona in the spring of 1996. Three schools participated in the program during that initial year. Since that time, an estimated 20 teachers have been trained to use the program and an estimated 12 teachers have used the program. Arizona has held three competitions: in the spring of 1996, the fall of 1996, and the fall of 1997. A total of 12 classes competed in these competitions, which took place at the Arizona state capitol building and included a simulated hearing component. Funding to support Project Citizen was raised from charitable donations from foundations and community organizations.[1] The state coordinator has recently received a $50,000 grant from the state's Department of Education for Project Citizen to start in 1998-99.[2] Project Citizen implementation in Arizona, therefore, is very strong and will likely grow dramatically over the next couple of years.

Arizona's Project Citizen Program at a Glance							
Year Project Citizen First Used	**Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995**	**Est. Teachers Using Since 1995**	**Date of 1998 Competition**	**State Hearings?**	**State Funding?**	**Other Funding?**	**Advisory Committee?**
1995-97	20	12	Dec. 6, 1997	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

State coordinator Lynda Rando is responsible for Project Citizen implementation in Arizona. Rando is Director, Center for Law-Related Education (LRE) at the Arizona Bar Foundation.[3] She also administers the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program for the Center for Civic Education. Rando relies on administrative support from the Bar Foundation and the aid of an assistant to help her implement and oversee the program.

---

[1] Interview by Writer Mott and Pete Weber with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, December 4, 1997.

[2] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, April 14, 1998; and e-mail interview by Writer Mott with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, June 3, 1998.

[3] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Lynda Rando, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Phoenix, Arizona, September 30, 1997.

Efforts to market Project Citizen to teachers in Arizona are initiated and coordinated by Rando. During the pilot year, Rando went to state legislator and Project Citizen supporter Herschella Horton, who helped her select three pilot schools. Since that time, Rando has relied on mailings and LRE newsletters to recruit teachers. Arizona also has had a few teachers who recruited their fellow teachers to participate. Rando completed a mass mailing to teachers in December 1997 to gain further interest and to demonstrate to the state legislature the support and demand for the program.[1] Rando does not target any specific type of teacher.

Rando has also begun using the education programs at the universities in Arizona as a means of recruiting and expanding the program. The LRE center now is doing pre-service training at Arizona State University-West.[2]

Rando feels that Project Citizen fits strongly with the state education standards. However, she has not used this connection as a primary means for recruiting teachers.

Janet Thor, a social studies teacher at Kyrene Middle School and a Project Citizen teacher whose class won the 1997 Project Citizen national competition, runs all of the teacher training sessions for Rando.[3] Rando, meanwhile, is responsible for recruiting teachers and setting up the trainings, i.e., arranging a location and materials.[4] Thor provides a detailed "how to" training session to teachers that includes a walk-through of the whole program and examples of past portfolios. Approximately 20 teachers have been trained to date in Arizona. No formal follow-up is provided to the teachers. Rando does, however, stay in touch with the teachers to make sure that they are going to attend the competition. She is always available to the teachers if they have any problems or concerns.

Arizona held its first competition in the spring of 1996. Three classes participated in this competition. Five classes from four schools then competed in the second competition in December of 1996. Four classes participated in this year's competition, which was held in December 1997. The competition consists of two components: a portfolio competition and simulated hearings. The simulated hearings are hosted at the State Capitol building each year. At the hearings, students present their portfolios and findings to three different panels of judges. Judges for the hearings include state legislators, legislative staff, CCE representatives, and members of the LRE center. The team that receives the highest combined score in the competition has its portfolio sent to the national competition. An Arizona school from Kyrene Centennial Middle School won the national competition for the 1996-97 school year. Each student who participates in the simulated hearings is given a certificate, while the winning school receives a plaque. Completed portfolios are displayed at the State Capitol during the two weeks before the simulated hearing takes place.

Since the program's inception in Arizona, Lynda Rando has spearheaded efforts, through the legislature and lobbyists, to raise money for Project Citizen. The first year she went to the speaker of the house of the Arizona State Legislature Mark Killian, who raised $8,000 for the program. Subsequently, she had Lori Large, a lobbyist, go to other lobbyists to solicit support from the agencies or businesses that they represented. Rando has also sent out fundraising letters signed by State Representative Herschella Horton. Horton is a state legislator and a strong advocate of the program. This was another effective means of garnering corporate support, especially when Horton followed up the letters with a phone call. Thus, Rando has been able to raise several thousand dollars in donations each year to support Project Citizen in Arizona.[1]

---

[1] Rando interview, December 4, 1997.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

Rando also worked to create a strong Advisory Committee consisting of legislators, teachers, and students. She has invited members of the foundations, corporations, and other private organizations that have donated money to serve on the committee. The advisory committee has been working to develop a unified funding strategy for procuring funds from the state legislature. The Arizona Legislature now has given approval of $50,000 for Project Citizen from the state's Department of Education budget. This money was secured largely through the work of State Representative Herschella Horton and State Senator Randall Gnant, both members of the Arizona advisory committee. Thus, Arizona will receive substantial financial support from the state for its Project Citizen program in the near future.

---

[1] Ibid.

CALIFORNIA

State Coordinator Contact Information
Roy Erickson, Director, Justice Education Programs
4808 Runway Drive
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
Phone: 916-863-6614
Fax: 916-863-6551
E-Mail: cacoord@aol.com

Status of Implementation

California was the pilot state for the American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project (AYCPP) sponsored by the Walt Disney Company in 1992 and 1993. At that time, over 500 classes and 18,000 students in California participated in the program.[1] However, after Disney withdrew its sponsorship of AYCPP and the Center for Civic Education (CCE) revitalized the program as *We the People... Project Citizen*, there was no effort to ensure that the teachers who had used the program as AYCPP would continue to do so. As a result, Project Citizen coordinators have been trying to build the program up all over again since 1995-96. During the last two years, approximately 75 sets of Project Citizen materials have been distributed to teachers.

California's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1992-93*	120	60	May	No	No	No	Yes

* Although the program began in 1992, data collected for this table was for usage and training since 1995.

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator and nine regional coordinators for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. Roy Erickson is the state coordinator and Director of Justice Education Programs for CCE. Since August 1997, he has received assistance in planning Project Citizen activities from Gayle Kernick, the coordinator for region 1. Kernick, a retired social studies teacher, has primary responsibility for statewide implementation of Project Citizen.

At the same time, Kernick and Erickson rely on the eight coordinators of the other nine Project Citizen regions to expand the use of the program across the state. Regional coordinators have not received any funding or training to implement Project Citizen other than the funds and guidelines provided for the implementation of *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. As a result, the use of Project Citizen has been very uneven throughout the state. Most Project Citizen activities are centered in regions 1 (Sacramento), 8 and 9 (Orange County), and 10 (San

---

[1] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Roy Erickson, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Fair Oaks, California, September 29, 1997.

Diego). Coordinators in regions 4 (Fresno), 5 (Canoga Park), and 7 (Whittier) are not aware of any teachers who have used or who are using the program.

In regions 8, 9, and 10, coordinators market the program to all middle school teachers with the assistance of the local school district.[1] These coordinators send the school district information about the program, which is inserted into the district's mass mailings to teachers. This allows coordinators to reach a wide audience of teachers and save the program postage and other related expenses. Such a strategy is currently being considered by Kernick for outreach throughout the state. He has approached the State Department of Education to obtain a list of all middle school principals and school districts in California.

In addition, Kernick and Michael Fischer of CCE have made several presentations on Project Citizen at teacher and school administrator conferences in both northern and southern California. On February 20, 1998 Fischer gave a presentation in Long Beach at the California Council for Social Studies.[2] On March 20, 1998, Kernick made a presentation to the California League of Middle Schools. Also in March, Fischer gave a presentation at the annual conference for middle school teachers in Burlingame.

Approximately 120 teachers throughout the state have been trained to use Project Citizen. Trainings have been conducted in several locations, including Sacramento (March 8, 1997); Marina del Rey (May 22 and 23, 1997); Santa Clara (August 5 and 6, 1997); San Diego (September 6, 1997); Elk Grove (September 25, 1997); and Anderson (October 13, 1997). Generally, the training sessions are conducted by the regional coordinators at social studies conferences and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* training sessions. In some cases, the coordinators have received assistance from teachers who have used the program. There is no effort to follow-up with teachers once they have participated in the training sessions.

In 1996-97, 12 classes submitted a portfolio for judging at the state-level competition in Sacramento in May 1997. Judging was provided by four teachers who had used the program. Region 10 was the only region to hold a local-level competition that year.[3]

Each class receives a certificate of participation signed by a state legislator. As use of the program increases, Erickson and Kernick hope to hold preliminary competitions in all regions, with the winning portfolio in each region sent to the state competition. As additional funding becomes available, they would also like to hold simulated hearings at the state level and pay the travel expenses for classes participating in such hearings.

Although California's Project Citizen implementation plan proposed a $56,000 budget for 1997-98 program activities, efforts to secure political support and state and private sector funding have progressed slowly.[4] In August 1997, Erickson and Kernick created a statewide Project Citizen

---

[1] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Pat Hitchcock, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Regions 8 and 9, Fountain Valley, California, February 11, 1998.

[2] Interview by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with Gayle Kernick, Project Citizen Assistant State Coordinator, Sacramento, California, February 10, 1998.

[3] Interview by Maria Gutierrez and Suzie Meltz with Jack Gaffney, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 10, San Diego, California, February 13, 1998.

[4] Interview by Lisa Driskill and Jody McCoy with Project Citizen Advisory Committee members, Sacramento,

Advisory Committee to make suggestions for teacher outreach and funding procurement activities. The committee roster includes staff of state legislators, state department of education officials, education advocates, teachers, business representatives, attorneys, and parents. The group will convene four times each year. The first two meetings were held on October 22, 1997 and February 10, 1998.

Efforts to obtain funding from the state legislature were not successful this year, although Kernick is optimistic that the program will receive support during the next legislative session. With the assistance of a legislative aide to the speaker of the California Assembly, the Advisory committee drafted a bill that would have provided $50 per student in grades 6 through 9 for participation in civic education programs. The effort failed when the committee was unable to find a sponsor to carry it this session.

Kernick is also seeking private sector support. He has recently submitted funding proposals to Wells Fargo Bank and Bank of America. Laura Mastrangelo, an education advocate who sits on the advisory committee as well as on the CCE Board of Directors, is also working to obtain funding from several corporations that have a history of donating to educational purposes in California.

At the local level, limited funds for Project Citizen have been raised by Jack Gaffney, the coordinator for region 10. He accepts public donations and sometimes auctions donated items to raise money for both *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen implementation in his region.[1]

California, February 10, 1998.

[1] Gaffney interview.

COLORADO

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Barbara Miller, Director Colorado Civic/Legal Education Program	
Social Science Education Consortium P.O. Box 21270 Boulder, CO 80308	
Phone: 303-778-7441	Fax: 303-778-0992
E-Mail: millerba@stripe.colorado.edu	

Status of Implementation

Implementation of Project Citizen in Colorado has varied since it began in the 1995-96 school year with one teacher. The kick-off year of Project Citizen, 1996-97, coincided with the receipt of a grant to implement Youth for Justice. The goal of Youth for Justice is to enhance civic responsibility among youth, using the classroom and community-based activities. Project Citizen was used by five teachers as a tool to implement the Youth for Justice program, one teacher using the program in two classes. In the 1997-98 school year four teachers returned to use Project Citizen again. No other teachers have elected to use the program. Teachers have used Project Citizen in both middle schools and high schools in Colorado. Approximately 57 teachers have been trained to use the program to date.

Colorado's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1995-96	57	7	May	In 1997	No	Yes	No

Barbara Miller, the Project Citizen state coordinator, is the Director of the Colorado Civic/Legal Education Program for the Social Science Education Consortium, a non-profit organization in Boulder. Her experience includes social studies teacher, social studies curriculum supervisor, teacher training, and curriculum development for middle and high school social science. She is also the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinator. She receives staff support for Project Citizen from the Director for Public Education at the Colorado State Bar Association. In addition, Miller receives limited volunteer assistance from the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators.

Outreach in Colorado is conducted by the state coordinator, and occurs primarily through informal networking and information sessions at Law Related Education Conferences. The State of Colorado received federal funding to create a Service Learning Network, which the state coordinator has targeted as well.

Fifty-seven teachers have received an introduction to Project Citizen through information sessions at conferences and formal training. In January 1997 the state coordinator held a full day training during the week and teachers received reimbursement for the cost of substitutes. The state coordinator used Youth for Justice funding to provide this service. Additionally, the 1997 training was followed with monthly problem solving meetings and visits to classrooms by the state coordinator. In the 1997-98 school year training has been limited to information sessions at law related conferences.

In May 1997, as a part of the Youth for Justice Summit, students presented six Project Citizen portfolios at the State Capitol for judging. Students presented portfolios to panels of experts, and answered questions posed by judges. Topics included police and youth relations, marijuana policy, and alternatives for abused and neglected youth. A similar competition at the State Capitol is scheduled for May 14, 1998. Competition in Colorado focuses less on the competitive aspects and more on the learning aspect for students. All participants receive awards.

Colorado receives no state funding and has no plans to seek it out. Federal funds granted for the Youth for Justice program during the 1996-97 school year facilitated the introduction and use of Project Citizen. Those funds were not reallocated for the 1997-98 school year. The state Juvenile Justice Council donated $700 to facilitate the May 1998 competition. The only additional funding Colorado receives is the annual $500 stipend from the Center for Civic Education.

CONNECTICUT

State Coordinator Contact Information	
James Schmidt, Executive Director	
Connecticut Consortium for Law, Citizenship and Education P.O. Box 150470 Hartford, CT 06115-0470	
Phone: 860-509-6184	Fax: 860-509-6187
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in Connecticut during the 1996-97 academic year. Nine social studies teachers used the program that year. Eight of the classes were in public schools. At least one of the public school teachers used Project Citizen in four classes that year. Twelve teachers used the program in 1997-98.

Connecticut's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	8	19	None	No	No	No	No

James Schmidt, Executive Director of the Connecticut Consortium for Law, Citizenship and Education, coordinates Project Citizen and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in Connecticut. Schmidt is also responsible for the administration of several state-initiated civic education and law programs, including Mock Trial, Debate, Legislative Visitation, and Student Conferences.[1]

While Schmidt did not develop a Project Citizen implementation plan, he has distributed Project Citizen materials and solicited teacher participation. He distributed nine sets of materials to teachers who were already using *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. In addition, he publicized the program in his newsletter and at a teacher conference in October 1997.[2]

Schmidt conducted a Project Citizen teacher training session at the 1997-98 State Teacher Conference with the assistance of Julie Jacquish, a teacher who used the program during 1996-97. Eight teachers attended the session, which included a review of program materials and suggestions for teaching it in the classroom.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Jody McCoy with James Schmidt, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Hartford, Connecticut, November 1997.

[2] Ibid.

There are no state or local Project Citizen competitions or hearings in Connecticut. Connecticut does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from the $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.

DELAWARE

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Lewis Huffman, State Social Studies Director	
State of Delaware, Department of Public Instruction Townsend Building P.O. Box 1402 Dover, DE 19903	
Phone: 302-739-4647	Fax: 302-739-4483
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Delaware has not implemented Project Citizen.[1]

Delaware's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
Not used	0	0	None	No	No	No	No

---

[1] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Lewis Huffman, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Dover, Delaware, October 6, 1997.

FLORIDA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Annette Boyd Pitts, Executive Director	
Florida Law-Related Education Assn., Inc. 1625 Metropolitan Circle, Suite B Tallahassee, FL 32308	
Phone: 850-386-8223	Fax: 850-386-8292
E-Mail: ABPflreaED@aol.com	

Status of Implementation

Florida began implementing Project Citizen in 1995-96 as a pilot program. Since 1995-96, approximately 26 teachers have used Project Citizen in their classrooms and 49 teachers have received Project Citizen training. The first Project Citizen competitions in Florida were held in 1996-97, when ten portfolios were entered in the statewide competition in Tallahassee. The 1998 Florida Project Citizen competition will be held in May in Tallahassee.[1]

Florida's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1995-96	49	26	May	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen state coordinator for Florida. Pitts is the Executive Director of the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc. in Tallahassee and has been the state coordinator of Project Citizen since the program was first introduced in Florida in 1995-96. Pitts shares the responsibilities for planning and implementation of Project Citizen with Joan Murphy, the Associate Director of Educational Programs at the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc.

Teacher outreach and marketing activities are coordinated by Pitts and Murphy. In the first two years of implementation (1995-96 and 1996-97), Florida did not have an established system for outreach or marketing to teachers. Teachers who received Project Citizen materials and who were invited to use the program in their classrooms were selected because of their previous experience with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* or other civic education programs administered by the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc.[2]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Joan Murphy, Associate Director of Educational Programs at the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., and Assistant to Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tallahassee, Florida, April 1, 1998.

[2] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Joan Murphy, Associate Director of Educational Programs at the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc., and Assistant to Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State

In 1997-98, Pitts and Murphy established a teacher outreach strategy that included sponsoring three Project Citizen training sessions for teachers and a Project Citizen awareness session at the Florida Council for Social Studies Teachers Annual Convention in Sarasota, Florida, in October 1997. Florida also has a unique civic education website (www.pubadm.fsu.edu/civiced) which was developed by the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc. The website, called "Florida CivicEd," was developed in cooperation with the Collins Center for Civic Education and Service at Florida State University. Pitts has plans to include information about Project Citizen on the website as part of Florida's outreach efforts.[1]

Approximately 49 teachers received training at three separate Project Citizen training workshops in Florida in 1997-98. No teacher training sessions were held prior to 1997-98. In November 1997, the Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc. sponsored two separate full-day comprehensive teacher training sessions conducted by Michael Fischer of the Center for Civic Education in Miami and Tampa. Twenty-eight teachers attended the training in Miami, which was also sponsored by Miami-Dade County Public Schools, and 11 teachers participated in the Tampa training. In February 1998, Murphy conducted a half-day teacher training workshop in Tampa for the Hillsborough County Public School District, which trained approximately ten additional teachers.[2] No formal follow-up with participants in the training sessions is conducted by Pitts, Murphy, or the school districts where the trainings are held.

In 1996-97, the first year that statewide competitions were held in Florida, approximately ten portfolios were sent to Tallahassee for judging.[3] Judging was provided by staff from the Florida Attorney General's office, the Florida Legislature and the Florida Department of Education, including the department's social studies supervisor. In 1997-98, approximately ten portfolios are expected to be submitted to the state coordinator's office in Tallahassee for judging in May 1998.[4]

No district-level competitions or simulated hearings have been held yet for Project Citizen in Florida. Miami-Dade County Public Schools is considering establishing a district-wide Project Citizen competition in 1998-99.[5] The 1997-98 teacher training sessions included instructions for conducting simulated hearings, and Pitts hopes to eventually establish a statewide simulated hearing competition in Florida.[6]

Since Florida began implementing Project Citizen in 1995-96, the state has received Project Citizen manuals, trainings by Michael Fischer, and the $500 annual stipend for state coordinators from the Center for Civic Education. The Florida Law-Related Education Association, Inc.

Coordinator, Tallahassee, Florida, October 2, 1997.

[1] E-mail interview by Sarah Wheat with Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tallahassee, Florida, April 3, 1998.

[2] Murphy interview, April 1, 1998.

[3] Murphy interview, October 2, 1997.

[4] Murphy interview, April 1, 1998.

[5] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Charles Murray, Social Studies Supervisor for Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida, November 19, 1997.

[6] Interview by Sarah Wheat with Annette Boyd Pitts, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tallahassee, Florida, February 10, 1998.

donates its staff time, the cost of additional Project Citizen manuals, training costs, and pay for substitutes for teachers who attend trainings to implement Project Citizen.

In 1997-98, Pitts applied for several grants from private foundations to support Project Citizen but did not receive funding. Pitts intends to reapply for grants in 1998-99 since she can now demonstrate that Florida trained 49 teachers in 1997-98 to use Project Citizen.

Pitts has not approached Florida legislators about funding Project Citizen and does not have an advisory committee for fund-raising.[1]

---

[1] Ibid.

GEORGIA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Michele Collins, Assistant Principal	
Ashworth Middle School 333 New Town Road Calhoun, GA 30701	
Phone: 706-625-9545	Fax: 706-625-0114
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Although Project Citizen was supposed to be implemented in Georgia for the first time during the 1997-98 school year, none of the ten teachers that were recruited and trained at the Georgia Council for Social Studies conference in October 1997 used Project Citizen in their classrooms. Teachers in Georgia were overwhelmed this year with implementing the revised quality core curriculum and did not feel they could take on Project Citizen as well. There are some Project Citizen workshops planned in conjunction with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* activities for summer 1998 in the hopes of recruiting more teachers for next year. One *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinator did purchase a set of Project Citizen books this year for the schools in her district.[1]

Georgia's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	10	0	None	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Michele Collins. Collins is an assistant principal at Ashworth Middle School and has been the state coordinator since Project Citizen's inception in Georgia in the fall of 1997. Collins has also worked with the Center for Civic Education on *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* for the past 11 years and has been involved with the international program Civitas. A retired educator, a staff director of a regional education agency, and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators help Collins with Project Citizen.[2]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Anne Ray with Michele Collins, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Calhoun, Georgia, April 28, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

Social studies teachers were targeted by Collins at the Georgia Council for Social Studies conference in October 1997. Brochures were sent to all social studies teachers attending the conference so they could sign up for Project Citizen workshops ahead of time. The initial goal was to get one classroom from every congressional district involved since there were only enough materials and funding for 10 or 11 sets. That was accomplished, so now it is up to individual schools and districts to buy more materials for their classrooms. Since then, at least one additional school system has bought Project Citizen materials for all of its middle schools. *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators also recruit teachers and purchase books for the schools.[1]

Ten teachers were trained at the state social studies teachers conference in October 1997. The Center for Civic Education conducted the training. Collins encourages teachers to call her staff with additional questions throughout the year.[2] More training sessions will occur over the summer and fall of 1998 in hopes of recruiting more teachers to begin using Project Citizen in the classroom during 1998-99.[3]

The first competition was planned for May 1998 but was canceled when none of the trained teachers used Project Citizen in their classrooms. If teachers use Project Citizen during the 1998-99 school year, then a state competition will be held in the spring of 1999. Portfolios will be judged by judges who are selected by the Georgia Law-Related Education Center and the Carl Vinson Institute at the University of Georgia.[4]

The only funding for Project Citizen is the $500 annual grant from the Center for Civic Education. Collins hopes to develop political support in the future. Individual school systems can purchase Project Citizen materials for their own schools at any time.[5]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Anne Ray with Michele Collins, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Calhoun, Georgia, February 5, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

HAWAII

State Coordinator Contact Information

Sharon Kaohi, Director of the Social Studies Curriculum Area

OASIS School Renewal Group
Hawaii Department of Education
189 Lunalilo Home Road, 2nd Floor
Honolulu, HI 96825

Phone: 808-394-1331
Fax: 808-394-1304

E-Mail: sharon_kaohi@notes.k12.hi.us

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Hawaii in October 1997. At that time, Sharon Kaohi, Director of the Social Studies Curriculum Area at the OASIS School Renewal Group (a division of the Hawaii Department of Education), and Michael Fisher of the Center for Civic Education (CCE) provided the first teacher training for Project Citizen at the Hawaii Association of Middle Schools (HAMS) annual conference.[1] Kaohi is the Project Citizen and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator. Twelve teachers and curriculum coordinators participated in the training. Kaohi planned the first Project Citizen competition for May 1998.[2]

Hawaii's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	12	2	May 22	No	No	No	No

Kaohi is responsible for coordinating Project Citizen in Hawaii. Kaohi directs the Social Studies Curriculum Area at the OASIS School Renewal Group, a resource center in the Hawaii Department of Education that provides instructional support to districts and schools. Her primary role is to help schools implement the state's social studies standards. She also directs the state's character education programs.[3]

Kaohi administers Project Citizen with Linda Kekina, who is co-coordinator of the program. Kekina is a classroom teacher at Mauna Loa Intermediate School. Kaohi also recruited Collette Dhakwa as a volunteer attorney consultant from Hawaii Friends of Civic and Law-Related Education to help administer Project Citizen. Hawaii Friends of Civic and Law-Related

---

[1] Sharon Kaohi, "*We the People... Project Citizen* 1997-98 Budget Narrative," Honolulu, Hawaii, November 21, 1997.

[2] Letter from Sharon Kaohi, Project Citizen State Coordinator, to Sarah Lowthian, Austin, Texas, October 27, 1997.

[3] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Sharon Kaohi, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 11, 1998.

Education is a local nonprofit that was created in the early 1990s to support youth in making healthy and responsible decisions with their lives. This organization supports *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen.[1]

Kaohi is responsible for marketing and outreach of Project Citizen. Her primary means of outreach include letters and e-mail about *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen to all district superintendents, principals, and school librarians in the state. She also followed up in writing and with phone calls to the 12 teachers who participated in the first Project Citizen training in October 1997. In her correspondence to teachers and administrators, Kaohi emphasizes the fact that Project Citizen will likely help teachers meet state curriculum requirements for middle school social studies (state standards are in the process of being developed).[2]

Kaohi offered the first Project Citizen training at a statewide conference for middle school teachers. This initial teacher training included a workshop directed by Michael Fisher of CCE and a review of the Project Citizen curriculum materials. Kaohi hopes to be able to send teachers to future CCE training sessions hosted outside Hawaii.

The first Project Citizen competition was held May 22, 1998. Three classes from two schools created portfolios on their selected public policy issues. Kaohi recruited judges to go to each school to examine the portfolios. Rather than collecting the portfolios to be displayed in a single location, Kaohi hoped this type of competition would make it easier for teachers to participate. The judges selected a portfolio to represent the state at the national competition.[3]

Kaohi receives the $500 annual stipend from CCE to support the implementation of Project Citizen. She benefits from in-kind support from the Hawaii Department of Education, where she writes letters, makes phone calls, and uses the e-mail system. Her time is also supported by the Department. Kekina and Dhakwa donate some time to administer the program.[4] There is no additional state or outside funding for Project Citizen.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

IDAHO

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Dan Prinzing, Teacher	
Les Bois Junior High School 701 East Boise Avenue Boise, ID 83706	
Phone: 208-336-9896	Fax: 208-338-3691
E-Mail: dprinzin@micron.net	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Idaho in 1996-97. During the first year, ten teachers used the program, but only one of the classes completed a portfolio. No teacher training sessions were offered during the first year. The state coordinator recruited seven new teachers to participate in the program during 1997-98 and offered all seven of them training. A competition was offered during the first year, but was limited since only one class submitted a portfolio. The state coordinator expects more classes to participate at this year's competition on May 15, 1998.

Idaho's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	7	17	May 15	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen in Idaho is the responsibility of state coordinator Dan Prinzing. Prinzing is a middle school teacher at Les Bois Junior High School in Boise. Prinzing also serves as the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinator for Idaho. Prinzing does not have any direct help implementing the program; however, he has called upon the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators when he needed help in the past.[1]

Prinzing is responsible for the marketing and outreach efforts in the state. During the program's initial year, Prinzing marketed the program solely to social studies teachers who had used the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* texts.[2] He also tried to recruit teachers from different regions of the state. This year Prinzing had one of his *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators give a presentation on Project Citizen at the state social studies conference.[1] Last year's winning portfolio was used at the conference to highlight the project. Prinzing does not use state education standards as a tool to market the program.

---

[1] E-mail interview by Writer Mott with Dan Prinzing, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boise, Idaho, October 14, 1997.

[2] Ibid.

Idaho has held only one teacher training to date. Rob Sauer, a teacher and a district coordinator, conducted the training. Seven teachers attended the training, which consisted of a "how to" session on the program and an example of a completed portfolio. Prinzing maintains regular contact with the teachers and is always available if they have any questions regarding the program.[2]

Idaho held its first competition in May 1997. However, only one class submitted a portfolio and as a result no judges were needed. A second competition is scheduled to take place on May 15, 1998. More classes are expected to participate in the competition this year. The competition consists of judges evaluating portfolios and does not include a simulated hearing component. Prinzing sponsors an award plaque for the winning school along with a $150 cash prize for the winning teacher.[3] Completed portfolios are then displayed at the State Capitol.

To date, Idaho does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from the $500 annual stipend from the Center for Civic Education. Prinzing is trying to expand the program significantly next year through the help of corporate sponsors. More specifically, Prinzing has been working to have the Albertsons Foundation sponsor the placement of Project Citizen texts in the two largest school districts in Idaho.[4] Prinzing has also been working with a state legislator to introduce a bill to fund the program.[5]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Letter from Dan Prinzing, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boise, Idaho, to Michael Fischer, Center for Civic Education, Calabasas, California, August 25, 1997.

[5] Prinzing interview.

ILLINOIS

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Michael Radz, Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services	
Community High School District 218 10701 S. Kilpatrick Avenue Oaklawn, IL 60453	
Phone: 708-424-2000, Ext. 517	Fax: 708-424-7361
E-mail: mradz@d218.edu	

Status of Implementation

Implementation of Project Citizen in Illinois is scheduled to begin in the summer of 1998. Therefore, no marketing, outreach, teacher training, or competitions have been done. At the end of January 1998, the Center for Civic Education had sent three sets of books to teachers in Illinois. One eighth grade American History teacher is confirmed to have used it in all five of her classes. Her classes did not create portfolios, but did simulate hearings as a classroom activity. Topics included freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and due process. The teacher uses Project Citizen as a complement to *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*.

Illinois' Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	0	1-3	none	No	No	No	No

Michael Radz, the Project Citizen state coordinator, is the Assistant Superintendent for Instructional Services for Community High School District 218. He accepted the state coordinator position in November 1997.

Illinois does not receive any Project Citizen support outside of the $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.

INDIANA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Lynn Nelson, Associate Professor and Director	
Purdue University Ackerman Center for Democratic Citizenship 1442 Liberal Arts and Education Building Room 4115A West Lafayette, IN 47907-1442	
Phone: 765-494-2372	Fax: 765-496-2210
E-Mail: lrnelson@omni.cc.purdue.edu	

Status of Implementation

Bob Leming was the Project Citizen state coordinator from 1994 to 1998. Lynn Nelson became the Project Citizen state coordinator in 1998 when Leming moved from Indiana to accept a job with the Center for Civic Education (CCE). Pam Luenz used Project Citizen for the first time in 1994-95 at Sunnyside Middle School. Since then, three other teachers have used the program in their classes. Dee Motz and Judy Carnine use Project Citizen with gifted and talented social studies classes; Leila Meyerratken uses Project Citizen with her foreign language classes. Three state competitions have been held (1996, 1997, 1998).

Indiana's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1994	Est. Teachers Using Since 1994	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1994-95	0	4	May 1	Yes	No	No	No

Nelson, who became the Project Citizen state coordinator in January 1998, is responsible for coordinating Project Citizen implementation. Nelson is the Director of the Ackerman Center for Democratic Citizenship at Purdue University. Before Nelson became the state coordinator, Project Citizen was coordinated by Bob Leming, Director of the Indiana Program for Law-Related Education (LRE). Leming was also the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator. After Leming accepted a job with the Center for Civic Education to be the national director of the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program, Nelson took over Project Citizen. *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* will remain with the Law-Related Education Program at Indiana University.

As state coordinator, Nelson is responsible for the marketing and outreach of Project Citizen. The teachers who have used Project Citizen have done most of the outreach to date. Judy Carnine and Pam Luenz gave presentations at statewide conferences, including the Indiana Council for the Social Studies and Indiana Youth Environmental Summit. Nelson invites local press to the annual state competitions to generate media coverage of the competitions. The teachers using the program have tried to recruit other teachers to use it; to date, Luenz recruited the teacher who replaced her when she took medical leave. Project Citizen helps meet Indiana's social studies standards.

No formal teacher training sessions have been conducted in Indiana. The teachers who currently use the program learned about it through other teachers; one teacher learned about it at a statewide conference where Luenz presented Project Citizen. The teachers used the Project Citizen materials to train themselves. Carnine visited one of Luenz's classes and looked at class portfolios before she implemented the program in her class.[1]

Judge Gregg Donat hosts the competitions in his county courtroom (Tippecanoe County). Nelson and Donat plan the competition to coincide with Law Day (first week in May); students come to the courthouse, present their portfolios, and answer questions from a panel of judges. Judges have included Judge Donat, Nelson, Leming, the president of the state bar association, and other community leaders. The students take a tour of the historic courthouse and the Bar Association hosts a pizza party for them. The mayor typically opens the event, and there is usually some radio and TV coverage.[2] Congressman Edward Pease joined the competition one year when Meyerratken's class invited him. He provided hand-signed certificates to all students who participated in her class's project.[3]

Indiana does not receive any direct financial support aside from the $500 from CCE. However, several organizations and individuals donate time and space. The State Bar Association donates money for the competitions. The LRE organization has paid for the bus trip for Carnine's class to travel to Lafayette for the competitions.[4] Classes have to come up with the money for portfolio materials and substitute teachers; each teacher pieces together funding in a different way. Meyerratken regularly seeks grants to support her class projects.[5]

Indiana enjoys strong political support for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, and that support can likely be tapped for Project Citizen. U.S. Congressman Dan Burton of Indianapolis sponsored and helped pass an amendment in 1997 to increase federal funding for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. Indiana Superintendent for Public Instruction Suellen Reed congratulated Burton in the press and highlighted the quality of the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program. While this support has not been directed at Project Citizen yet, it indicates there is a firm foundation from which to build.

---

[1] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Pam Luenz, former Project Citizen Teacher, Sunnyside Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[2] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Gregg Donat, Judge, Tippecanoe County, Lafayette, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[3] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Leila Meyerratken, Project Citizen Teacher, Tecumseh Middle School, Lafayette, Indiana, February 20, 1998.

[4] Interview by Sarah Lowthian with Judy Carnine, Teacher, Franklin Township Middle School, Indianapolis, Indiana, February 19, 1998.

[5] Meyerratken interview.

IOWA

State Coordinator Contact Information

Linda Martin, Program Consultant

Area Education Agency Seven
3712 Cedar Heights Drive
Cedar Falls, IA 50613

Phone: 319-273-8215 | Fax: 319-273-8219

E-Mail: none

Status of Implementation

Iowa first began using Project Citizen in January 1997. To date, 30 teachers have been trained and 20 are believed to have used the program. Five classes participated in a statewide competition in the spring of 1997, and five classes participated in a statewide convention in March 1998. The 1998 convention was a modified competition format with less emphasis on student presentations and more emphasis on dialogue among students, classes, and public policy professionals.

Iowa's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	30	20	March 5	Yes	No	No	No

Implementation of Iowa's Project Citizen program is the responsibility of Linda Martin, a program consultant at Area Education Agency Seven.[1] Martin is also the state coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, and as a result has assistance in implementing Project Citizen from five *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators.

The state coordinator initiates most of the outreach and marketing efforts related to Project Citizen. Martin informs teachers about Project Citizen by disseminating information at conferences, mailing recruitment letters, and sharing information with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* congressional district coordinators. In addition, she has developed an extensive network of educational professionals who help her share information about Project Citizen.[2] She plans to provide a Project Citizen presentation at the School Administrators' Meeting in August 1998 to help educate administrators about the program.[3]

---

[1] Interview by Brandi Stewart with Linda Martin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cedar Falls, Iowa, February 9, 1998.

[2] Interview by Brandon Atkinson with Linda Martin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cedar Falls, Iowa, October 7, 1997; and Martin interview, February 9, 1998.

[3] Martin interview, February 9, 1998.

According to Martin, Project Citizen complements other Iowa state civics programs, has clear links to the state's civic education standards, and is closely related to the statewide effort to encourage community service learning. These are key marketing advantages for the program in Iowa. However, Martin believes other already successful and supported methods for teaching civic education, along with a perception that Project Citizen is very time consuming, make it difficult to encourage teachers to use Project Citizen in Iowa.[1]

Approximately 30 teachers have been trained since the program's inception in 1997. The majority of training activities are conducted by the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators and other Area Education Agency staff. Approximately ten people are trained to provide Project Citizen training to teachers throughout the state.[2]

Iowa's Project Citizen training is a combination of information about the Center for Civic Education, a review of the Project Citizen materials, and a "how to" session for using Project Citizen in the classroom. Following training sessions, the state coordinator and the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators are available to answer teachers' follow-up questions about the program.[3]

Iowa held its first statewide Project Citizen competition in the spring of 1997 with five participating classes. The competition followed the format suggested by the Center for Civic Education with formal student presentations, judges, and awards.

In March 1998, Iowa held a statewide convention. Similar to the competition, students made short presentations, answered questions about their projects, and were evaluated and scored by community judges. The convention format facilitated information sharing among students and dialogue with participating community representatives by having all student presentations and interaction with community representatives occur in one large room as opposed to individual class presentations to judges in separate rooms. Five classes from three middle schools participated in the 1998 statewide convention.[4]

Judges for the 1997 and 1998 competition were representatives from the Iowa Center for Law-Related Civic Education, Iowa State Teachers Association, Grinnell College, Iowa Department of Health, local newspapers, and Big Brothers/Big Sisters.

Iowa's Project Citizen program does not have any direct financial support outside of the $500 Martin receives from the Center for Civic Education. However, Martin is able to leverage the Center for Civic Education funds by coordinating Project Citizen activities with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* activities when appropriate. Staff support from the Area Education Agency also helps Martin leverage Project Citizen funds.

Through statewide marketing efforts, the state coordinator is slowly building community and political support for the Project Citizen program. Martin has made efforts to dovetail Project Citizen marketing activities with the work she is doing for *We the People... The Citizen and the*

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

Constitution, Mock Trials, the State Social Studies Cirrocumuli, and community services projects. She receives assistance in these activities from John Wheeler of Drake University.[1]

---

[1] Martin interview, October 7, 1997.

KANSAS

State Coordinator Information

Richard Leighty, retired (formerly with Kansas Department of Education)

4726 SE 21st Street
P.O. Box 126
Tecumseh, KS 66542-0126

Phone: 785-379-5779 Fax: none

E-Mail: none

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Kansas in 1997-98. Richard Leighty, the Project Citizen and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator, conducted the first Project Citizen teacher training sessions in the spring of 1998 in conjunction with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in-service training programs. He focused on launching Project Citizen in the Wichita and Seneca school districts. Wichita is an urban district with diverse socioeconomic and ethnic groups; Seneca is in a rural, agricultural part of north-central Kansas and has a much more homogeneous population.[1] An estimated 70 teachers have been trained in Kansas, and four teachers have used the program to date.

Kansas' Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	70	4	June	No	No	No	No

Leighty is a retiree who formerly worked in the social studies division of the Kansas Department of Education.[2] He coordinates Project Citizen with assistance from the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators. There is a district coordinator in each of the four congressional districts in Kansas. They are all teachers or former teachers.[3]

Leighty works with the school district leaders in Wichita and Seneca to invite teachers to the Project Citizen teacher training sessions. Through curriculum directors, he sends information about Project Citizen to teachers in those districts. He and the district coordinators follow up by phone and with a letter with all teachers who participate in training.

---

[1] Richard Leighty, *Implementation Plan and Budget for the 1997-98 School Year*, Tecumseh, Kansas, December 1997.

[2] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Richard Leighty, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tecumseh, Kansas, February 17, 1998.

[3] Ibid.

Leighty is responsible for providing Project Citizen teacher training. In 1997-98, Leighty held two Project Citizen teacher training sessions, one in Wichita and one in Seneca.[1] These included an overview of the program and emphasized the role of the portfolio. Workshop participants were encouraged to have their classes make oral presentations about the portfolios to another class or before a group of adults as a culminating activity, since the statewide competition will not include hearings. Teachers were also encouraged to participate in a statewide competition of Project Citizen class portfolios. The district coordinators and Leighty contacted all teachers who participated in the training by phone and sent them follow-up letters.[2] Approximately 70 teachers have participated in these trainings to date. Leighty hosted the training workshops as part of in-service trainings that were conducted in conjunction with *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in-service training.[3]

Leighty has scheduled the first statewide competition for June 1998. Classes will submit portfolios to be judged by the state and district coordinators. He modeled the program after the national competition and, therefore, did not include student hearings as a component.[4]

Leighty essentially serves as the state coordinator for Project Citizen and *We the People... the Citizen and the Constitution* in a volunteer capacity. The congressional district coordinators also donate their time. The Kansas Supreme Court is active in supporting Project Citizen and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution,* but the Law-Related Education group in Kansas is not active. Leighty has not initiated any other fund-raising to date.[5]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Sarah Lowthian with Richard Leighty, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Tecumseh, Kansas, April 28, 1998.

[2] Leighty, *Implementation Plan and Budget for the 1997-98 School Year.*

[3] Ibid.

[4] Leighty interview, February 17, 1998.

[5] Ibid.

KENTUCKY

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Tracey Sharpe, Court Designated Worker	
Juvenile Services Division Administrative Office of the Courts 212 1/2 N. 20th St., Suite 2 Middlesboro, KY 40965	
Phone: 606-248-5811	Fax: none
E-Mail: tracey@urgentmail.com	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced to teachers in Kentucky in early 1997.[1] Since then, efforts to publicize the Project Citizen program have grown and the program has been marketed to many different types of educators throughout the state. In 1997-98, the Kentucky coordinators piloted Project Citizen to juvenile justice workers. To date, approximately 45 teachers including juvenile justice workers have been trained to use Project Citizen. An estimated 15 teachers used the program in the 1997-98 school year. Kentucky will have its first Project Citizen statewide competition in May 1998.

Kentucky's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	45	15	May 28	No	No	Yes	No

Project Citizen is being implemented under the state's Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Court-Community Relations Department, managed by Deborah Williamson, along with the AOC's Juvenile Services Division. Tracey Sharpe, an intake officer for the AOC Court Designated Worker Program, a unit of the Juvenile Services Division, is the Project Citizen state coordinator.[2] Project Citizen is only one of various youth education initiatives administered through the AOC. AOC also administers *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*.

Coordination of Project Citizen is a group effort. Together, Williamson and Sharpe share various responsibilities in implementing Project Citizen throughout the state. Both Williamson and Sharpe conduct site visits, training, outreach and program administration. Sharpe and Williamson use conferences, recruitment letters, newsletters, and word of mouth to market the program to teachers. In marketing the program, they generally rely on existing networks to recruit teachers. For example, they request teacher contacts from the *We the People... The*

---

[1] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Tracey Sharpe, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Middlesboro, Kentucky, October 9, 1997.

[2] Center for Civic Education, "News from the States," *Center Correspondent*, vol. 10, no. 1 (Fall 1997), p. 8.

Citizen and the Constitution district coordinators and also rely on the statewide network of Court Designated Workers. As Project Citizen expands, the AOC hopes to develop regional groupings of Project Citizen by combining state senatorial districts to form local networks.

Previously, outreach efforts were primarily aimed at teachers using other Center for Civic Education Programs and social studies teachers. However, because Project Citizen is based in the offices of the AOC, which works with juvenile offenders, the program is being promoted as a "diversion program" to Court Designated Workers and other juvenile justice professionals.[1] During August 25-27, 1997, Sharpe provided an overview (not a formal training session) of Project Citizen during the tenth annual Court Designated Worker Conference in Lexington.[2]

Approximately 45 people have been trained to use Project Citizen, including both teachers and juvenile justice professionals.[3] Training has occurred in collaboration with both CCE and the AOC. A variety of presenters have been used, including a CCE representative, a member of the AOC staff, and a combination of both. There have been two types of training sessions that have taken place, one geared toward teachers and the other for juvenile justice workers. Trainings were held in fall 1997 on the assumption that they would prepare teachers to use the program in the spring. On August 7-8, 1997, Project Citizen trainer Williamson held a joint in-service training for both *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen in Frankfort, Kentucky. A second comprehensive training session was held December 10-12, 1997, geared mainly toward juvenile justice professionals. Furthermore, both Sharpe and Williamson keep in contact with teachers to find out if they are experiencing any problems with the program. Williamson and Sharpe also conduct site visits.

The first statewide competition is scheduled for May 28, 1998, in Louisville, Kentucky. It will be held in conjunction with prevention fairs sponsored by AOC's Juvenile Services Department and will consist of portfolio displays in two different tracks. Winners will be chosen from both the juvenile justice pilot group and traditional schools group.[4] All portfolios will be displayed at the State Capitol for a period of time, and teachers will be invited to view the portfolios. AOC will rely on its usual network of judges such as justices from the Kentucky Supreme Court and district and circuit court judges. As the program develops and regions are established, AOC will recruit regional coordinators and encourage local-level competition to precede the state competition.[5]

The Court-Community Relations Department of the AOC has provided the majority of the funding for Project Citizen training, competition, and other expenses, while seeking funding from other sources to expand and continue the program. AOC is currently exploring all potential funding sources for Project Citizen, including any available grant funds.

The support of Kentucky's Court of Justice for civic education efforts is longstanding. Chief Justice Robert F. Stephens and AOC's Director Paul Isaacs have committed the AOC's financial and administrative resources to a variety of education projects, including Project Citizen. Mr. Charles Leachman, General Manager of AOC's Juvenile Services Division, also provides support by encouraging his staff's (i.e., Sharpe's) participation in these and other education initiatives. Thus, Sharpe and Williamson are able to work on Project Citizen during their regular work hours.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Tracey Sharpe, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Middlesboro, Kentucky, February 27, 1998.
[4] Tracey Sharpe, *Kentucky Project Citizen Implementation Plan for 1997-1998*, Middlesboro, Kentucky, n.d.
[5] Ibid.

In regard to political support, AOC contacted each member of the state legislature by mail to provide awareness of Project Citizen and to ask for their support of the program. Legislators whose house or senate district contains an active program were personally contacted. Legislative contacts will continue and expand as the program develops, and state legislators will be encouraged to participate at the local level. They will also be invited to attend or participate in the competition.

LOUSIANA

State Coordinator Contact Information
John Alexander, Social Studies Coordinator
Jefferson Parish Public Schools
501 Manhattan St.
Harvey, LA 70058-4443
Phone: 504-349-7883 | Fax: 504-349-8906
E-Mail: none

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Louisiana in 1997. Books have been distributed to ten classes.[1] There have been no competitions in Louisiana to date, but there is one scheduled to take place in June 1998.

Louisiana's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	10	10	June	No	No	No	No

John Alexander is the Project Citizen state coordinator and is responsible for the coordination of Project Citizen in Louisiana. Alexander is a Social Studies Coordinator for Jefferson Parish Public Schools.[2] Alexander is also the state coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*.

Alexander is responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities. Alexander used the Louisiana Conference for Social Studies in September 1997 to advertise Project Citizen. He will do the same in August 1998.[3]

There has been one Project Citizen training session, which took place at the Louisiana Conference for Social Studies in September 1997. It is not known how many teachers were trained at this session. Alexander also plans to hold a training session in August 1998 at the same conference. He will be the presenter at this conference.[4]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Pete Weber with John Alexander, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Harvey, Louisiana, February 26, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

No state competitions have been held to date. A competition is planned for spring 1998.[1]

Louisiana does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from a $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

MAINE

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Pam Beal, retired teacher	
58 Sylvan Rd., South Portland, ME 04106	
Phone: 207-767-2737	Fax: none
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

During the 1993-94 school year, Maine was one of the pilot states for the American Youth Citizenship Portfolio Project (AYCPP) sponsored by the Walt Disney Company. During that year, five classes created portfolios. The following year, when Disney withdrew sponsorship of the program, all activity ceased in Maine.[1]

Maine's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1993	Est. Teachers Using Since 1993	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1993-94	12	5	None	No	No	No	No

State coordinator Pam Beal, a retired teacher, is responsible for implementing Project Citizen in Maine. Beal also coordinates CCE's *We The People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program.

Beal targets teachers and school districts that are geographically close to her because they are "easier to service" in a rural state such as Maine. Beal conducts most of her outreach during the *We the People ... The Citizen and the Constitution* teacher training sessions. During her outreach, she focuses on building relationships with teachers, even if just over the telephone. She emphasizes that Project Citizen may raise a student's test scores in "Learning Results," the state educational standards test.

When Beal held training sessions in the 1995-96 school year, she had some teachers bring a student to "sample" the material. She thought the student involvement was helpful. There were no organized training sessions during 1997-98. Several teachers were given personal orientations about the program. Twelve teachers have been trained in Maine to date.

The only Project Citizen competition to date was during 1995-96. Three portfolios were submitted and displayed at the Statehouse.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Pam Beal, Project Citizen State Coordinator, South Portland, Maine, October 13, 1997; and telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Pam Beal, Project Citizen State Coordinator, South Portland, Maine, February 5, 1998.

Beal's political contact is Elizabeth Mitchell, who is a state legislator and a former teacher. Although Mitchell is supportive of the program, no efforts have been made to introduce legislation to fund or support Project Citizen.

MARYLAND

State Coordinator Contact Information
James Adomanis, Director
Maryland Center for the Study of History and Civic Education
541 Norton Lane, Suite B
Arnold, MD 21012-2359
Phone: 410-974-4680 Fax: 410-222-5608
E-Mail: mcshce27@annap.infi.net

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in Maryland during the 1996-97 school year. Since that time, approximately 20 teachers have received training and 11 teachers are believed to have used it in the classroom. Maryland hosted its first Project Citizen state competition in March 1998.

Maryland's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	20	11	March	No	No	No	No

James Adomanis has been the Project Citizen state coordinator since 1996. He is the director of the Maryland Center for the Study of History and Civic Education. He is also the coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. He is assisted by the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators, friends, and state colleagues within Maryland.

Adomanis is responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities in Maryland. He uses a variety of methods in enlisting and informing teachers about the program, including conferences, recruiting letters, announcements in newsletters and magazines, and word of mouth. All the teachers in Maryland using Project Citizen are social studies or American government teachers. They are all located within 40 miles of metropolitan Baltimore and teach in public schools. According to Adomanis, school principals play little or no role in the conduct of Project Citizen.

Adomanis has conducted six training sessions since 1996. In addition to himself, presenters have included Harford County Supervisor, Ira Hiberman; Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) Supervisor, Marcie Toma-Taylor; and MSDE Facilitator, Diane Johnson. As of December 1997, 20 volunteer teachers were trained in the use of Project Citizen. Ten of these teachers implemented the program in at least one of their classrooms.

Maryland's initial state competition is planned for March 14, 1998, at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis. Maryland does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from the $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.

MASSACHUSETTS

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Barbara Locurto, Director, IMPACT II	
55 New Dudley St., Bldg. #1 Boston, MA 02120	
Phone: (617) 635-9440	Fax: (617) 635-6571
E-Mail: blocurto@boston.k12.ma.us	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen got a late start in 1997, its initial year, due to the implementation of new learning standards in the state.[1] Teachers were focusing on revising their existing curricula and, as a result, were not immediately receptive to a new program. Thus, Project Citizen is being used only in Boston. Plans are developing to expand to Worchester, but as of yet no classrooms there have used the program.[2] The state coordinator held Project Citizen information sessions in February 1997 and January 1998, but no information was provided as to the number of teachers trained or using the program in the state.

Massachusetts's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	Unk.	Unk.	None	No	No	No	No

Barbara Locurto is the state coordinator of Project Citizen in Massachusetts. She has held this post since 1996. Locurto is the director of IMPACT II, the state teacher network. This post places her in an excellent position to administer and coordinate the program in the state. Additionally, she is located in Boston, the state capitol, which further facilitates her coordination with lawmakers and Project Citizen "influencers."

Locurto is responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities in Massachusetts. She targets social studies teachers as potential users of Project Citizen.[3] She primarily recruits teachers she knows and those who have expressed interest in the program. Outreach comes in the form of teacher workshops (February 1997 and January 1998). These workshops have been the most effective means of teacher outreach in Massachusetts. This method requires more resources than she is able to muster given the travel required and the limited funding of $500 provided by CCE.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Paul Shelton with Barbara Locurto, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Boston, Massachusetts, October 10, 1997.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

Locurto is responsible for all teacher training activities. To date, no formal training sessions have been provided; instead, Locurto has focused on information sessions and workshops.

No information about additional financial support has been provided.

MINNESOTA

State Coordinator Contact Information

Roger Wangen, retired (formerly with the Minnesota Department of Children, Families, and Learning)

3928 Xerxes Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55410

Phone: 612-920-2639
Fax: 612-922-8755

E-Mail: nrwangen@mn.uswest.net

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Minnesota in 1996-97. Although Project Citizen was used in only one middle school classroom the first year, notable progress has been made since then to recruit and train teachers to use the program. An estimated 110 teachers have participated in six training sessions offered during November 1997 to March 1998.[1] The future of Project Citizen is promising, particularly since the Minnesota Legislature has appropriated $60,000 for expanding the program statewide during fiscal years 1998 and 1999.

Minnesota's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	110	13	May 14	No	Yes	Yes	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator and the Minnesota Center for Community Legal Education (MCCLE), which serves as the fiscal agent for and administratively supports the program. Roger Wangen is the state coordinator and has been affiliated with the civic education programs of the Center for Civic Education (CCE) since 1985. Wangen recently retired from 28 years of service with the Department of Children, Families and Learning, where he was a curriculum specialist and head of international education.

The MCCLE, based at the University of Minnesota, recently helped lobby successfully for state-level funding for the civic education "package" of Project Citizen, *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, and a third civic education program, Youth Summit on Violence Prevention. Jennifer Bloom, MCCLE Director, Debra Berghoff, MCCLE Assistant Director, and Wangen share responsibility for organizing Project Citizen teacher training workshops and the state-level portfolio competitions.[2]

---

[1] E-mail interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Debra Berghoff, Assistant Director, Minnesota Center for Community Legal Education, St. Paul, Minnesota, May 8, 1998.

[2] Interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Jennifer Bloom, Director, Minnesota Center for Community Legal

Since November 1997, MCCLE has put considerable effort into outreach and marketing of Project Citizen throughout the state. Information about Project Citizen is available at conferences, through recruitment letters and newsletters, and by word of mouth. Recently, Berghoff established a web page to inform teachers interested in participating in workshops (http://www.ccle.fourh.umn.edu). For mass mailings, the state is divided into 12 educational cooperative service units that are responsible for disseminating information to schools. One unit specifically helped advertise the training workshop that took place in Marshall in December 1997. To encourage middle school teachers to use Project Citizen and for their classes to participate in the competition, teachers are offered a free set of classroom materials and $50 to help cover costs.

Project Citizen is packaged with two other civic education training programs in outreach and marketing efforts, primarily because the three receive state funding through a common appropriation. Government, civics, and U.S. history teachers of grades 5-12 are targeted. There is a direct match between the Minnesota Graduation Standards and Project Citizen, and the latter program is promoted as a service-learning program based on performance assessment.[1] Community groups, such as the Minnesota Citizens League's Youth Citizens League, are also encouraged to use Project Citizen.

The MCCLE is responsible for organizing teacher training. Teacher training is an informative session about CCE and an overview of Project Citizen, a review of Project Citizen classroom materials, and a "how to" session for teaching Project Citizen in the classroom. All participants of a training workshop receive a Project Citizen student handbook, and this is considered enough information for a teacher to get started with Project Citizen in the classroom. Prior to 1997, there was no follow-up with teachers who received Project Citizen materials, but the MCCLE now has a list of the names and school addresses of teachers who have participated in each of the eight training workshops offered in 1997-98.

The trainers varied among the workshops. A session in Marshall, led by an experienced teacher who had completed Project Citizen in her classroom, was considered more effective.[2] Her actual experience with the program enables her to provide clear instructions on how to use the materials and guide students through the project. Another workshop in St. Paul was led by Wangen, Bloom, and Joan Beaver, a district coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. The six training workshops held in the first half of 1998 were led by a mix of the aforementioned trainers.

In 1996-97, one school (two seventh-grade classes at the St. Croix Catholic School in Stillwater) used Project Citizen and produced a portfolio that was sent to the national portfolio competition in 1997. The first state portfolio competition will take place in the rotunda of the State Capitol on May 14, 1998, where the Project Citizen portfolios will be displayed. It is anticipated that five schools will participate and that the portfolios will be judged by local judges and legislators. The competition is particularly important to promote visibility of Project Citizen, because of the

---

Education, St. Paul, Minnesota, January 6, 1998.

[1] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Joan Beaver, Minnesota District 6 Coordinator, *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, January 28, 1998.

[2] Bloom interview..

state's appropriated funds and legislators' interest in seeing how the program can help middle school students meet required education standards.

The future of Project Citizen implementation is promising since the Minnesota Legislature has appropriated $60,000 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to expand the program statewide. The strategy of "packaging" Project Citizen as a middle school civic education program along with two established high school civic education programs worked well. State Representative Mary Jo McGuire, Vice Chair, Government Operations Committee, drafted legislation making an appropriation to the Minnesota Historical Society for a grant to the MCCLE for legal education for three programs: Project Citizen, *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, and Youth Summit. State Representative Steve Trimble, Chair, Economic Development Finance Committee, guided the legislation that eventually funded the programs. Bloom, together with Wangen, led presentations and lobbied for the legislative funds. Both believe that Project Citizen sponsorship by the National Conference of State Legislatures was crucial for gaining support for the program by the Minnesota Legislature.

Project Citizen has received in-kind support, as well. The Minnesota State Court System donated meeting space in the Minnesota Judicial Center near the State Capitol for the November 1997 workshop. The MCCLE provides staff to write letters for recruitment and arranges workshops. Beaver, a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* congressional district coordinator, has served as a workshop presenter, and the principal at St. Croix Catholic School allows the Project Citizen teacher in that school release time to train teachers.

MISSISSIPPI

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Lynette McBrayer, Director of Bar Services and Law-Related Education	
Mississippi State Bar Association 643 N. State Street P.O. Box 2168 Jackson, MS 39225-2168	
Phone: 601-948-4471	Fax: 601-355-8635
E-Mail: mcbrayer@msbar.org	

Status of Implementation

The 1997-98 school year is the first year of Project Citizen implementation in Mississippi. Four teachers have been recruited to use the program this year, and Mississippi is planning to host its first portfolio competition in May.

Mississippi's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-1998	0	4	May 15	No	No	No	No

Project Citizen implementation is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Lynette McBrayer. In addition to serving as the Mississippi state coordinator, McBrayer is the Director of Bar Services and Law-Related Education at the Mississippi State Bar Association. McBrayer is also the state coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution.*[1]

McBrayer mailed information on Project Citizen to middle school teachers who completed the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* fall 1997 information session. Teachers must commit to completing a portfolio for the state competition in order to receive free Project Citizen materials.[2] To date, McBrayer has not conducted any training sessions.[3]

McBrayer scheduled the first state competition for May 15, 1998. She estimates that seven classrooms will compete.[4] Members of the Mississippi State Bar Young Lawyers' Association will serve as judges, as will the State Bar Association lobbyist. McBrayer also hopes that a member of the lieutenant governor's staff will also serve as a judge.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Beth McNeill with Lynette McBrayer, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Mississippi State Bar Association, Jackson, Mississippi, January 29, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] E-mail interview by Beth McNeill with Lynette McBrayer, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Jackson, Mississippi, April 15, 1998.

McBrayer has contacted the lieutenant governor's office and the office of the Speaker of the Mississippi State Legislature about Project Citizen. However, McBrayer does not plan on formally pursuing state funding until the program has been piloted one year.[2]

---

[1] McBrayer interview, January 29, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

MONTANA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Sally Broughton, Middle School Teacher	
10663 Bridger Canyon Road Bozeman, MT 59715	
Phone: 406-585-3544	Fax: none
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was introduced in Montana in 1996-97. In that school year, only one class completed a portfolio. In 1997-98, ten sets of books were distributed to teachers, and the program is being used in ten classes.[1] No competitions have been held to date, but a portfolio competition is planned for the spring of 1998.

Montana's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	10	11	Spring	No	No	No	No

Sally Broughton is the Project Citizen state coordinator in Montana. This is her first year in that position. Broughton is a middle school teacher. She has not yet conducted any training sessions, but she is actively involved with assisting classes that use Project Citizen.[2]

Broughton is responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities. Broughton markets Project Citizen to teachers whom she knows. Because she mostly markets the program to teachers who are easy to contact, most of the teachers are in large cities and are near Bozeman. In addition, Broughton presented information about Project Citizen at Montana's annual teachers convention in the fall of 1997.[3]

To date, no formal teacher training sessions have been held. Broughton offers assistance to teachers who use Project Citizen.[4] Broughton did hold an information session for ten teachers during the 1997-98 school year.

1998 will be the first year in which a competition is held. The competition is scheduled for May. It is expected that ten classes will participate. The competition will be portfolio based.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Pete Weber with Sally Broughton, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Bozeman, Montana, October 6, 1997.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

Broughton also hopes that students will be able to attend the competition. Judges have not yet been selected for this competition.[1]

Montana does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from a $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education. Broughton plans to look to the state legislature as well as to state philanthropists such as Ted Turner as possible future sources of funding.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

NEBRASKA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Tom Keefe, Director, Law-Related Education	
Nebraska State Bar Association 635 S. 14th St., Suite 200 Lincoln, NE 68501-1809	
Phone: 402-475-7091 (ext. 30)	Fax: 402-475-7098
E-Mail: msbasm05@nol.org	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in Nebraska in 1996-97. To date, a total of 24 teachers have been trained, and one teacher's class completed a portfolio in 1997. In 1997-98, seven sets of books were distributed. It is expected that a number of these classes will complete portfolios.[1]

Nebraska's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	24	8	May	No	No	No	No

Tom Keefe is the Project Citizen state coordinator and the state Law-Related Education (LRE) director. Keefe is also the state coordinator for *We the People… The Citizen and the Constitution*. Keefe receives assistance from John LeFeber, a former teacher who now works at the Department of Education as the Social Studies and Civics Specialist.[2]

Keefe is responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities. He is assisted by Ron Withem, former speaker of the house for Nebraska, and Jon LeFeber. Keefe has used four major strategies to market Project Citizen. First, he has done mass mailings to social studies teachers. These mailings explained what Project Citizen is and asked for interested teachers to respond. Second, Keefe uses the LRE newsletter to advertise Project Citizen. Third, Keefe has made contacts at private schools. He feels that the free books might be a great incentive to use the program at these schools. Finally, Keefe speaks to social studies methods classes at Nebraska Wesleyen University and at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln to encourage their use of Project Citizen.[3] Project Citizen does meet some of Nebraska's state education standards.

There have been several information and training sessions in Nebraska. On October 24, 1997, LeFeber conducted a half-day training in Lincoln at the statewide Law-Related Education conference. At this training session sample lessons were taught and suggestions were made regarding resources and contacts for future projects. Keefe has held several additional information sessions in Omaha, Lincoln, and Scottsbluff. In addition, former Speaker of the Nebraska Legislature, Ron Withem, held a training session in Lincoln. An estimated 24 teachers have been trained.

---

[1] Interview by Pete Weber with Tom Keefe, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Lincoln, Nebraska, January 8, 1998.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

No state competitions have been held to date. A competition is scheduled for the spring of 1998. Keefe hopes to help classes appear in local hearings before the relevant governing bodies.[1]

Nebraska does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from a $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education. Keefe is currently working with the Nebraska Legislature to pass a bill to endorse Project Citizen and to get a bill in the legislature to appropriate money for Project Citizen. There is a great deal of support in the Nebraska Legislature, including Withem, Senator Jennie Robak, Senator LaVon Crosby, and Senator Don Wesley, all of whom have agreed to judge portfolios.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.

NEVADA

State Coordinator Information	
Judith Simpson, Coordinator	
Partners in Education, Inc. 861 East Glendale Avenue Sparks, NV 89431	
Phone: 702-353-5533	Fax: 702-353-5536
E-Mail: judithsimpson@hotmail.com	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first piloted in Nevada in 1996-97. One class, an eighth grade gifted and talented social studies class, used the curriculum, conducting research and developing recommendations for restoration of the USS *Nevada* flag and presenting its work to the Nevada Legislature. Although the students were unable to obtain legislative support for their recommendations, the curriculum and concept were well received by the legislature, resulting in a $32,000 funding allocation for the program in 1997-99.

Given the influx of thousands of new Nevada residents, Project Citizen has a strong chance for expansion in Nevada. To date, 25 teachers have been trained to use Project Citizen and 12 teachers have used the curriculum. The first Project Citizen competition is scheduled for May 1998. The state coordinator plans to use the state funding to get Project Citizen into 100 classrooms by 1998-99.[1]

Nevada's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	25	12	May	Yes	Yes	No	No

Implementation of Nevada's Project Citizen program is the responsibility of Judith Simpson, coordinator, Partners in Education Inc., the state's law-related education agency. Simpson is also the coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, and as a result has assistance in implementing Project Citizen from the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators, individual teachers, and staff within her organization.

Simpson has a goal of getting Project Citizen in 100 classrooms by 1998-99.[2] To reach this goal, Simpson targets a variety of teachers, including those using other Center for Civic Education programs, social studies and government teachers, experienced teachers, and new teachers. Primary means of outreach include presentations at conferences, newsletters, and direct mailings. Simpson believes that principal support for the curriculum is important to the success of Project Citizen, and she provides presentations to school principals.[1] According to Simpson, Project Citizen has clear links to the state's civic education standards, a selling point when marketing Project Citizen.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Brandi Stewart with Judith Simpson, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Sparks, Nevada, October 8, 1997.

[2] Ibid.

Project Citizen training sessions are organized by the state coordinator with support from the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators. The trainings are a combination of information about the Center for Civic Education, a review of the Project Citizen materials, and a "how to" session for using Project Citizen in the classroom. A total of three people are trained to provide Project Citizen teacher training, and in 1997-98 six training sessions were held throughout the state. A total of 25 teachers have been trained since the program's inception in Nevada.[2]

Although Project Citizen was piloted in Nevada in 1996-97, only one class used the curriculum that year, and no competitions were held. The first Project Citizen competition is planned for May 1998.[3]

Simpson was able to secure $32,000 from the Nevada Legislature to fund Project Citizen in 1997-99. Simpson believes that the funding was a direct result of students' Project Citizen presentation to the Nevada Legislature in 1997. The pilot eighth-grade class used the Project Citizen curriculum to conduct research and develop recommendations for funding the restoration of the USS *Nevada* flag. The class presented its findings and recommendations to produce new license plates and use the associated revenue to fund restoration of the USS *Nevada* flag. Although the legislature did not approve the students' recommendations, it was highly supportive of the Project Citizen program, appropriating program funds for the 1997-99 biennium. Given this support, the fact that Project Citizen clearly helps meet state standards, and the enormous population growth occurring in Nevada, Simpson believes there is tremendous opportunity to expand the program throughout the state.[4]

---

[1] E-mail interview by Brandi Stewart with Judith Simpson, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Sparks, Nevada, March 30, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Simpson interview, October 8, 1997.

[4] Ibid.

NEW MEXICO

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Dora Marroquin, Teacher Consultant	
11600 Academy Road NE, Apt. 1311 Albuquerque, NM 87111	
Phone: 505-299-2510	Fax: none
E-Mail: bdjlglm@earthlink.net	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was introduced in New Mexico in 1995-96. An estimated 120 teachers have been trained since the program's inception but fewer than two dozen are believed to have used the program.[1] Due to minimal use by teachers, no competitions or other Project Citizen events were held in 1995-96 or 1996-97. The first Project Citizen event was held January 31, 1998, in conjunction with a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* hearing. This event served as a showcase for completed Project Citizen portfolios. Four classes presented portfolios, and one class participated in the hearing. A statewide competition is tentatively scheduled for May 1998.[2]

New Mexico's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1995-96	120	21	May	No	No	No	No

Implementation of New Mexico's Project Citizen program is the responsibility of Dora Marroquin, a long-time teacher and currently a Ph.D. candidate. Marroquin recently finished a term as president of the New Mexico Council for the Social Studies and is currently a teacher consultant for the New Mexico Geographic Alliance.[3] Marroquin is also the coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*, and as a result has assistance in implementing Project Citizen from four *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators.[4]

Marroquin initiates the marketing and outreach efforts related to Project Citizen and receives assistance from the four *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators. Marroquin and the district coordinators, one of whom is a teacher, market Project Citizen to teachers at conferences, by talking with colleagues, and through newsletters. Marroquin relies on her contacts at the New Mexico Council for the Social Studies and the New Mexico Geographic Alliance.[1] According to Marroquin, Project Citizen is linked to the state's civic education standards.

---

[1] E-mail interview by Brandi Stewart with Dora Marroquin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Albuquerque, New Mexico, February 17, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Interview by Brandi Stewart with Dora Marroquin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Albuquerque, New Mexico, November, 2, 1997; and e-mail interview by Brandi Stewart with Dora Marroquin, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Albuquerque, New Mexico, February 25, 1998.

[4] Marroquin interview, February 25, 1998.

Approximately 120 teachers have been trained since 1995-96. Training activities are organized and conducted by Marroquin and the four *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators. New Mexico's Project Citizen teacher training is a combination of information about the Center for Civic Education and a review of the Project Citizen materials. There is no formal system for follow-up with teachers after the training sessions, other than sending invitations to competitions and events.[2]

The first Project Citizen event was a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen Showcase. Held January 31, 1998, in Albuquerque, the Showcase provided an opportunity for students to display their portfolios and to participate in a Project Citizen hearing that was judged by teachers and lawyers. Nearly 40 parents attended the Showcase. Four classes showcased portfolios; one class participated in a hearing. A Project Citizen competition is tentatively scheduled for May 1998.

Marroquin has worked to develop legislative support for Project Citizen. She has talked with several legislators and invited them to be judges at the competition. In January 1998, Representative Mimi Stewart introduced H.E. 25, a bill that would provide funding to support Project Citizen. Marroquin and the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators testified in support of the bill in front of the Education and Appropriations and Finance Committees. Although the bill passed the New Mexico house, the legislative session only lasted one month and the bill did not make it through the senate.[3] No funds are available to support the program at this time other than those provided by the Center for Civic Education.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Marroquin interview, November 2, 1997.

[3] Marroquin interview, February 25, 1998.

NEW YORK

State Coordinator Contact Information
Stephen Schechter, Executive Director
Council for Citizenship Education
Russell Sage College
45 Ferry Street
Troy, NY 12180
Phone: 518-244-2363 | Fax: 518-244-3125
E-Mail: schecs@sage.edu

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was introduced in New York in 1996-97. Project Citizen has been slow to start, but recently there has been evidence of growing activity in the state. It is estimated that 87 teachers have been trained to use Project Citizen, but the teachers using the materials in the classroom have not been tracked.[1] Research surveys uncovered only one teacher who used Project Citizen materials in the classroom. Although no hearing or competition has yet taken place, a competition is planned for spring 1998 provided teachers and classrooms are identified to participate in the competition.

New York's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	87	1	Spring	No	No	Yes	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Stephen Schechter. Schechter is a professor at Russell Sage College in Troy, New York, and Executive Director of the Council for Citizenship Education located at the college. In 1997, he hired Michele Ringrose to be Project Coordinator for Project Citizen.[2] With her help, Schechter hopes to achieve greater coordination and implementation in New York. Schechter is also the state coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution,* so he is able to use his network of district coordinators for that program to help him with Project Citizen coordination. Although neither Schechter nor Ringrose has received training to implement Project Citizen, they do have sufficient funds to operate the program. In addition to the $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education, Schechter allocates funds to Project Citizen from his Council for Citizenship Education budget.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Rachel Feit with Stephen Schechter, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Troy, New York, October 1, 1997.

[2] Ibid.

Schechter's Project Citizen outreach efforts target teachers using other Center for Civic Education programs, social studies or government teachers, experienced and new teachers, and his friends who teach. Schechter uses a variety of methods to market the program. In 1997-98, Schechter used letters to teachers, articles in the New York State Council for the Social Studies newsletter, programs designed for teacher training to be offered by the Council for Citizenship Education, book fairs to promote Project Citizen materials, and meetings such as the Law, Youth and Citizenship Conference, Central New York Council for the Social Studies, New York State Middle School Conference, and the Annual Mini-Conference of the Capital District Council for the Social Studies to encourage teachers and administrators to use Project Citizen.[2]

Teacher training is organized by Schechter and consists of a review or "walk through" of Project Citizen classroom materials and "how to" sessions for using Project Citizen in the classroom. In 1997-98, 75 to 100 teachers are going to be trained to use Project Citizen; however, it is not known if these teachers are implementing the program.

Schechter hopes to have the first state competition in 1998 if there is sufficient interest by New York teachers and students. The competition will be portfolio only. No formal simulated hearings are planned.

For the 1997-98 school year, Schechter has allotted $12,873 in his Council for Citizenship Education budget for Project Citizen. Schechter anticipates travel costs to be around $600, competition $300, and general office expenses approximately $300. Other monies will be spent on personnel, fringe benefits, and indirect costs.

---

[1] Stephen Schechter, *Project Citizen: 1997-98 Implementation Plan,* Troy, New York, n.d.

[2] Ibid.

NORTH CAROLINA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Pamela Riley, Director	
North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence 20 Enterprise Street, Suite 2 Raleigh, NC 27607-7375	
Phone: 919-515-9397	Fax: 919-515-9561
E-Mail: pamela_riley@ncsu.edu	

Status of Implementation

North Carolina is in its second year of implementing Project Citizen. During the first year of implementation, 1996-97, the 12 *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators were each asked to recruit one teacher from their respective districts to use the program. Twelve teachers received free materials. One class completed a state portfolio.[1] In the second year of implementation, 1997-98, there were four Project Citizen training sessions throughout the state.[2] Two portfolios were received for the state competition on February 27, 1998.[3]

North Carolina's Project Citizen Program at a Glance							
Year Project Citizen First Used	**Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996**	**Est. Teachers Using Since 1996**	**Date of 1998 Competition**	**State Hearings?**	**State Funding?**	**Other Funding?**	**Advisory Committee?**
1996-1997	215	18	February 27	No	No	Yes	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the Project Citizen state coordinator, Pamela Riley. Riley is also the director of the North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence. Riley has organized and conducted all of the Project Citizen training sessions as well as the state competition. Riley also coordinates *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and relies on district coordinators from this program to contact teachers in their districts who express interest in Project Citizen.[4]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Rachel Feit with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina, October 3, 1997.

[2] Interview by Beth McNeill with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina, January 14, 1998.

[3] E-mail interview by Beth McNeill with Pamela Riley, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Raleigh, North Carolina February 24, 1998.

[4] Riley interview, January 14, 1998.

Riley markets Project Citizen as a violence prevention program. The Project Citizen training sessions primarily have been held at Safe School Seminars sponsored by the North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence.[1]

In the fall of 1997, Riley invited every middle school teacher in North Carolina to attend one of four Safe School Seminars that she conducted throughout the state. The afternoon portion of the all-day seminars served as an awareness session for Project Citizen. Riley also held a Project Citizen awareness session at the state social studies conference.[2] To date, Riley has trained 215 North Carolina teachers.

In the first Project Citizen competition in 1996-97 only one portfolio was entered in the state competition. In an effort to increase the number of portfolios received, for 1997-98 Riley made teachers sign a letter agreeing to complete a portfolio in order to receive free Project Citizen materials. Five teachers committed to completing a portfolio; however, only two portfolios were received. The competition was held at the State Capitol on the same day as the North Carolina *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* competition. State legislators served as judges. Both years the winners received T-shirts and plaques. All participants received certificates of appreciation for competing.[3]

Riley uses in-kind support from the North Carolina Center for the Prevention of School Violence to implement Project Citizen. In addition, this center was able to use grant money from its alliance with the North Carolina Partnership for Character Education to purchase 18 sets of Project Citizen books. Riley serves on many different committees and is constantly looking for new partnerships and new sources of funding.[4]

Riley is also working to build political support for the program. She was able to get a bill introduced in the North Carolina Legislature to fund Project Citizen. Although the bill did not pass, it received bipartisan support and was signed by 16 legislators. Riley has built on this support by inviting the 16 legislators to Project Citizen awareness sessions and by asking state legislators to serve as judges.[5]

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

OHIO

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Libby Cupp, Economic & Career Education Coordinator	
Apollo Career Center 3325 Shawnee Road Lima, OH 45806-1454	
Phone: 419-998-2984	Fax: 419-998-2994
E-Mail: ap_cupp@noacsc.ohio.gov	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was introduced in Ohio in February 1997. The start of Project Citizen implementation in Ohio has been modest, but positive. An estimated 46 teachers have been trained since 1997. It is estimated that 27 teachers used the program in 1996-97 and at least an additional 4 teachers in 1997-98. In 1996-97, three classes completed a portfolio and submitted them for competition and display at the Ohio State Capitol. A competition for the 1997-98 year is planned for June.[1] As the program grows, it is likely that simulated hearings will take place on a state level.

Ohio's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	46	31	June	No	No	Yes	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Libby Cupp. Cupp has been in the education profession for over 20 years and is currently the Economic & Career Education Coordinator for the Apollo Career Center in Lima, Ohio. Affiliated with Center for Civic Education programs for many years, Cupp also serves as a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinator. Cupp is the key contact for anyone wanting information on Project Citizen in the state.

Cupp depends on additional educational support from the following individuals: Karen Heath, Assistant Director, Ohio Department of Education; the 38 Economic Education Coordinators and the 98 Career Education Coordinators; Nick Topougis, Director, Ohio *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*; and the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* coordinators in the 19 congressional districts.[2] State and community support comes from the following: Ohio House of Representatives; Senator Robert Cupp, Ohio Senate; NCSL

---

[1] Interview by Rachel Feit with Libby Cupp, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Lima, Ohio, January 29, 1998.

[2] Libby Cupp, *We the People... Project Citizen: Ohio Proposal*, Lima, Ohio, n.d.

Legislative Committee members and chairpersons in Ohio; community service organizations; and Robert Taft, Ohio Secretary of State.[1]

Cupp is responsible for the marketing and outreach of the program. Teacher outreach and marketing is done through flyers, meetings, one-on-one conversations, and community leaders. If an educator is receptive to the program through outreach, Cupp sends a letter to the teacher to follow up. In addition, a contract form is sent to the teacher, which requires the teacher to make a commitment to complete a portfolio in exchange for receiving free Project Citizen materials.[2]

Cupp has found that using the economic and career education network of educators has been a successful strategy to disseminate information about Project Citizen. It is easier for Cupp to reach schools in her district because of her responsibilities as Economic & Career Education Coordinator; however, she uses her network of 38 Economic Education Coordinators and 98 Career Education Coordinators to reach the other school districts in the state. In addition, the ties the Economic Education Coordinators have with the Ohio Department of Education help Project Citizen get more statewide recognition through dissemination by the Department of Education.

Cupp is not trained to provide in-depth Project Citizen training for teachers. Instead, she tries to encourage information sessions about the program. An estimated 46 teachers have been informed about Project Citizen. Three information sessions have been held in Ohio so far. On October 3, 1997, the Economic Education Coordinators held a session on Project Citizen. The Ohio Center for Law-Related Education held a session on October 25, 1997, and the Career Education Coordinators held a training session in December 1997.

The Ohio Center for Law-Related Education also sponsored a Project Citizen training session as a component of its Youth for Justice program on January 21, 1998. Denee Mattioli, the Tennessee Project Citizen state coordinator, conducted the training. In March, the Ohio Council for Social Studies held a training session for Project Citizen at its conference as well.

In the 1996-97 school year, a state competition was held at the Ohio State Capitol. The three classrooms that completed the Project Citizen program were asked to send their portfolios to the capitol for the competition. When the portfolios were on public display, a panel of judges made up of state legislators and their legislative aides decided on the winners. For 1997-98, a competition is planned for June.

Project Citizen has not received any additional financial support at the state level over and above that provided by the Center for Civic Education. Although Cupp tried to pursue funds through the legislature, she was not successful. Cupp believes that the legislature does not intend to fund the program in the future, but will support Project Citizen by name. Part of the reason for the lack of financial support is that the legislature believes if it designates funds to Project Citizen it will have to give money to every education program that requests separate appropriations. Additionally, the Ohio Legislature has been focused on creating a more equitable funding scheme for Ohio public schools as the result of a recent Ohio Supreme Court ruling, meaning that the legislature will likely not consider funding any new education programs until this situation is resolved.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Cupp interview.

Although funding is scarce, teacher Brad Calhoun took matters into his own hands and applied for a grant from the Martha Holdings Jennings Foundation of Youngstown. He included his Project Citizen plans in his grant proposal on civic awareness and community volunteerism and received $2,500 from the foundation.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Rachel Feit with Brad Calhoun, Middle School Teacher, Boardman Local, Youngstown, Ohio, January 21, 1998.

OKLAHOMA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Michael Reggio, Law-Related Education State Coordinator	
Oklahoma Bar Association P.O. Box 53036 Oklahoma City, OK 73152	
Phone: 405-416-7005	Fax: 405-524-1115
E-Mail: mreggio@aardvark.ucs.ou.edu	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was formally introduced in Oklahoma in 1997-98. The program is still in its initial stages. It is estimated that five teachers have been trained and have used Project Citizen in Oklahoma.

Oklahoma's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	5	5	None	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Michael Reggio. Reggio is the State Coordinator for Law-Related Education at the Oklahoma Bar Association. Reggio is also the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator co-sponsor. Reggio has recruited Pene Huntington to serve as the Project Citizen trainer for the state. Huntington has experience using Project Citizen in the classroom.[1]

In 1997-98, Reggio sent a letter to every school to inform them about Project Citizen. In addition, the Oklahoma LRE newsletter advertising Project Citizen went to 14,000 teachers, and others in the fall and winter of 1997. Reggio believes one-on-one targeting of teachers is the most effective, but does not get a chance to do this very often. Instead, he relies on newsletters and other means.[2]

Reggio plans to have the first training on August 15, 1998 through the Oklahoma Bar Association. It will be an informative session about Project Citizen and a review of materials. It will also include a "how to" session led by Huntington. For this training, the LRE program hopes to expand the ten sets of Project Citizen materials to 30 sets.[3]

---

[1] Michael Reggio, *Implementation Plan and Budget*, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, n.d.

[2] Interview by Rachel Feit with Michael Reggio, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, February 10, 1998.

[3] Ibid.

Reggio would like to have a district competition for the six districts of Oklahoma and a state competition for Project Citizen in the future.

Reggio has the support of a member of the Oklahoma Legislature and has established a subcommittee to deal specifically with the program. From his $500 stipend, he has designated some funding for Pene Huntington, teacher trainer and chair of the Project Citizen subcommittee, who will do additional training at the Oklahoma Council for the Social Studies conference.[1]

---

[1] Michael Reggio, *Implementation Plan and Budget*, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, n.d.

OREGON

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Marilyn Cover, Executive Director	
Classroom Law Project 6318 SW Corbett Portland, OR 97201	
Phone: 503-245-8707	Fax: 503-245-8538
E-Mail: cover@lclark.edu	

Status of Implementation

Efforts to implement Project Citizen in Oregon began during the 1997-98 school year. Although it is not clear how many teachers have used the program in their classes, at least one teacher in the state reported using the program currently.

Oregon's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	0	1	None	No	No	No	No

Marilyn Cover, Executive Director of the Classroom Law Project, is responsible for coordinating Project Citizen in Oregon. No information about Oregon's marketing and outreach efforts, teacher training sessions, state competitions, or financial support were provided.

PENNSYLVANIA

State Coordinator Contact Information
Lon Weber, Senior Vice President for Education
Freedoms Foundation
P.O. Box 706
1601 Valley Forge Rd.
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0706
Phone: 800-896-5488 | Fax: 610-935-0522
e-mail: lweber@ffvf.org

Status of Implementation

Implementation of Project Citizen began in the 1996-97 school year. Twelve teachers were trained that year. Eight of the classes created portfolios and participated in the state competition on May 15, 1997. The winner participated in the national competition and won third place. Cedarbrook Middle School, the school of the winning class, has designated Project Citizen as one of two project-based civics programs that social studies teachers are required to use as a supplement to their curriculum. The state coordinator secured a $6,000 grant from the Stewart Huston Charitable Trust for the 1996-97 school year and $31,380 from the State Department of Education for the 1997-98 school year. These funds have been instrumental in the expansion of the program. In 1997-98, coordinators expect that up to 28 classes will participate in the four regional competitions. The top three finishers in each region will participate in the state competition on May 12, 1998. CCE distributed 19 sets of free books in Pennsylvania between June 1, 1997 and January 23, 1998.[1]

Pennsylvania's Project Citizen Program at a Glance							
Year Project Citizen First Used	**Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996**	**Est. Teachers Using Since 1996**	**Date of 1998 Competition**	**State Hearings?**	**State Funding?**	**Other Funding?**	**Advisory Committee?**
1996-97	12	28	May 12	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Handling Project Citizen implementation in Pennsylvania is state coordinator Lon Weber. He is the Senior Vice President for Education at the Freedoms Foundation. The Freedoms Foundation is an organization established by President Eisenhower to recognize contributions to America in the spirit of the founding fathers. Presently, the organization also teaches a variety of civic education programs at its campus.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Brandon Atkinson with Lon Weber, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, February 12, 1998; and telephone interviews by Brandon Atkinson with Chuck Canning, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 2, Pennsylvania; Jennie-Lynn Knox, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 4, Pennsylvania; and Dave Morris, Project Citizen Regional Coordinator, Region 3, Pennsylvania, February 26, 1998.

Weber has created a strong organizational structure to support Project Citizen. He uses Freedoms Foundation staff to help with coordination, outreach, and other related tasks. In addition, he has recruited four regional coordinators who are responsible for implementing Project Citizen in their designated regions; this includes marketing and outreach, training, and organizing regional competitions. These individuals include George Franz (610-388-7505 / Penn State, Project Vision), Chuck Canning (610-432-2992 / teacher), Dave Morris (412-397-5551 / retired), and Jennie-Lynn Knox (412-471-6226 / law clerk). Although some of the regional coordinators work together, they believe they all would benefit from further coordination among themselves. This strong organizational support allows Weber to focus on building political and financial support for Project Citizen.

The marketing and outreach strategy in Pennsylvania has evolved over its two years of implementation. Initially, Weber focused teacher recruitment and outreach on the area in and around Philadelphia. This targeted effort led to eight classes producing portfolios. First illustrating Project Citizen's potential in a small region helped to recruit regional coordinators, gain political and financial support, and raise the awareness of the program for the following year. During the second year, the state coordinator expanded marketing and outreach efforts to the entire state.

For the second year of implementation, coordinators have created a division of labor between themselves. Generally speaking, the regional coordinators work to gain support of teachers and principals in individual schools, while the state coordinator focuses on district and state education administrators, as well as leaders of private schools and home school associations. The state coordinator asked each regional coordinator to recruit ten teachers to submit a portfolio in the May 1998 competition.

Coordinators have used the following outreach techniques: sending a recruitment letter on a State Department of Education listserv; purchasing a listing of middle school principals from the State Department of Education and calling them individually; making presentations at social studies conferences; targeting teachers they know or who have used *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*; and mass mailings to social studies teachers.

The regional coordinators organize the training sessions, but the state coordinator tries to attend to offer assistance. The first teacher training session took place on March 24, 1997. Three other training sessions have been held. Since 1996, twelve teachers have been trained. At these sessions the coordinator gives a brief description of Project Citizen, discusses the expectations he has of the teachers, and presents logistics of the competition. Some coordinators assure teachers they can call them for further technical assistance or help with logistical issues on an as-needed basis.

During the first year of implementation, Freedoms Foundation held a state competition on its campus. Eight classes presented their topics in a hearing with three judges. The judges included Ralston Jones (Adjunct Assistant Professor, Delaware Valley College), James Milne (Professor of Government, West Chester University), and Richard Stevens (President and CEO, New Century Bank). One class presented its topic as a skit, rather than as a portfolio; the others presented their portfolios. All participants received a certificate of participation. The winner participated in the national competition and won third place.

During the second year of implementation, four regional competitions and a state competition will be held. Regional coordinators will send the top three finishers in each of their competitions to the state competition held on May 12 and award them a trophy. All participants receive a certificate of participation. Freedoms Foundation reimburses all travel expenses for attending the competition and provides lunch. Coordinators expect 28 classes will participate in total.

The state coordinator has been ambitious and successful in acquiring political and financial support. During the first year of implementation, the state coordinator successfully applied for a $6,000 grant from the Stewart Huston Charitable Trust. Weber believes that this initial grant was instrumental in the State Department of Education's decision to allocate $31,380 for the project's second year of implementation. He made this contact by calling the Deputy Secretary of the State Department of Education and introducing himself and Project Citizen. Currently, Weber is lobbying to make a Project Citizen presentation at an Intermediate Unit (IU) Coordinating Committee meeting; the audience would be IU Directors who make important funding and curriculum decisions for their districts.

RHODE ISLAND

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Henry Cote, Director, Ch. I and Ch. II	
Pawtucket School District, Administration Bldg., Park Place Pawtucket, RI, 02860	
Phone: (401) 729-6376	Fax: (401) 729-6546
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in Rhode Island in 1996-97. During the initial year, there were five teachers trained and two teachers implementing the project. During the 1997-98 school year, there were seven teachers trained and seven teachers implementing the project. The state competitions are held in the spring, early enough to get the portfolio to the national competition. Currently, there is no outside funding for Project Citizen in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	12	9	Spring	No	No	No	No

Henry Cote, the state coordinator, is a retired educator, currently administering educational programs for the state part-time. He has been in education for 38 years. Cote also administers *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in Rhode Island. He receives assistance administering the program from four district coordinators: John Waycott, Charles Golden, Carlo Gamba, and Michael Trofi. There are two congressional districts, and each district has two coordinators. The district coordinators also run the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program in Rhode Island. The district coordinators are responsible for recruiting teachers, securing *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* and Project Citizen funding, distributing books, running trainings, and most other duties. The state coordinator oversees the entire program. He relies heavily on the district coordinators for the daily operation of Project Citizen.[1]

Cote is responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities. He is assisted by the four district coordinators listed above. They target teachers using other Center for Civic Education material, social studies and government teachers, and principals. Cote uses word of mouth, recruitment letters, and conferences to enlist participants, but he believes that personal visits with teachers is the best method for recruitment.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Suzie Meltz with Henry Cote, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Pawtucket, Rhode Island. April 15, 1998.

Trofi, one of the district coordinators, conducts the training sessions. These training sessions include walk-throughs of Project Citizen, "how to" sessions about teaching Project Citizen in the classroom, and information about the Center for Civic Education. Since 1996, 12 teachers have been trained.

State competitions take place annually in the spring. This year the competition will be held in late May or early June. The competitions are judged by legal professionals, teachers, and others from the community.[2] The portfolios are gathered and judged, but are not displayed.[3] Last year there were five portfolios submitted for the competition.[4]

Rhode Island does not receive any direct financial support for its Project Citizen program aside from a $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Henry Cote, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Pawtucket, Rhode Island, October 8, 1997.

SOUTH CAROLINA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Cindy Coker, Law-Related Education Director	
South Carolina Bar P.O. Box 608 Columbia, South Carolina 29202	
Phone: (803) 252-5139	Fax: (803)799-4118
E-Mail: cindy.coker@scbar.org	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen is in its infancy in South Carolina. There is very little information available about the implementation of the project thus far, and there are very few teachers, if any, using Project Citizen in the classroom.

South Carolina's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.	Unk.

Cindy Coker, the state coordinator, is the Director of Law-Related Education at the South Carolina Bar. She is also the state coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in South Carolina.

Coker is responsible for all the outreach and marketing efforts in South Carolina. She distributes Project Citizen books at state social studies conferences and at state middle school conferences. Coker also asks her *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinators to help disseminate information about Project Citizen.[1]

Thus far, there have only been Project Citizen awareness sessions at the South Carolina Council for Social Studies conferences.[2] There have been no competitions thus far in South Carolina.[3]

During 1996-97, Cindy Coker was able to get the South Carolina Legislature to approve funding for Project Citizen in South Carolina, but the governor line–item vetoed the funding.[4] She is pursuing further funding from the legislature.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Suzie Meltz with Cindy Coker, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Columbia, South Carolina, October 3, 1997.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

SOUTH DAKOTA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Mark Rockafellow, Principal	
Marion High School P.O. Box 207 Marion, South Dakota 57043	
Phone: (605) 648-3615	Fax: (605) 648-3652
E-Mail: rockm@gwtc.net	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in South Dakota in 1996-97. During the initial year, there were three teachers using the program. In the 1997-98 school year, there were four teachers using Project Citizen. There have been 19 teachers trained since 1996. The program is in the beginning stages in this state, and there have been no competitions thus far in South Dakota.

South Dakota's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	19	7	None	No	No	No	No

Mark Rockafellow, the state coordinator, is the secondary principal of Marion High School in Marion, South Dakota. He has been a teacher for nine years and a principal for four years.[1] Rockafellow is solely responsible for the dissemination of books and promotion of the program in South Dakota, but he receives assistance when needed from the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator, Lennis Larson. Rockafellow is one of the regional coordinators of *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*.

Rockafellow is solely responsible for Project Citizen's marketing and outreach activities in South Dakota. Rockafellow recruits teachers at state social studies conferences, where he presents workshops on Project Citizen. He also uses word of mouth and a recruiting letter to spread the word about Project Citizen. He does not target any particular type of educator. Project Citizen helps to fulfill the state standards for civic education in South Dakota.

So far, Rockafellow has conducted one training session and has trained about 19 teachers. The training session was held at a state social studies conference. The training session consisted of walk-throughs of Project Citizen classroom materials, a "how to" session about Project Citizen, and information about the Center for Civic Education. Rockafellow has followed-up with those teachers who attended the training sessions with letters and phone calls.[1]

---

[1] E-mail interview by Suzie Meltz with Mark Rockafellow, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Marion, South Dakota, April 3, 1998.

No competitions have been held thus far in South Dakota. Outside of the $500 received annually from the Center for Civic Education, there are no groups or individuals that have donated money or time to Project Citizen in South Dakota.

---

[1] Ibid.

TENNESSEE

State Coordinator Contact Information
Denee Mattioli, Professor
East Tennessee State University
Rural Route II, Box 1965
Elizabeth, TN 37643
Phone: 423-439-4203 Fax: 423-439-8362
E-Mail: mattioli@access.etsu-tn.edu

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was implemented in Tennessee for the first time during the 1997-98 school year. Teachers were introduced to Project Citizen in August 1997. A total of ten teachers currently have been trained and are using Project Citizen materials in their classrooms. More teachers have expressed interest in using Project Citizen next year. No state competitions are planned for the 1997-98 school year but the state coordinator expects to have a few classrooms complete portfolios. There is no budget for Project Citizen now, which makes implementation difficult. But progress is being made with teacher recruitment, and opportunities for more involvement should continue to grow.[1]

Tennessee's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	10	10	None	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Denee Mattioli. Mattioli is a full-time professor at East Tennessee State University and also serves as a district coordinator for *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in Tennessee. Mattioli has graduate students help her part-time. Previously, she directed *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* in Illinois. Michael Fischer also asked her to conduct training for the Youth for Justice Program in Columbus, Ohio, in 1998.[2]

Mattioli is new to Tennessee, and when she began Project Citizen, she told CCE she would start small and build. Tennessee is a large state, so Mattioli is not able to cover the entire state by herself. She successfully recruited ten teachers in the eastern part of the state. These teachers have committed themselves to recruiting and training other teachers so Mattioli will not have to do it all herself in the future.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Anne Ray with Denee Mattioli, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Elizabeth, Tennessee, February 10, 1998.

[2] Mattioli interview, February 10, 1998; and telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Denee Mattioli, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Elizabeth, Tennessee, October 13, 1997.

As an ex-officio member of the Tennessee Council for Social Studies, Mattioli was able to meet with the board and provide them with copies of student handbooks. She showed them pictures of a portfolio that students in Indiana made. Out of this session, six teachers requested materials. In March 1998, Mattioli also presented Project Citizen at the Tennessee Council for Social Studies state conference where more teachers expressed interest in using Project Citizen during 1998-99.[2]

For the 1997-98 school year, Mattioli was the only trainer. In August 1997, she brought in ten teachers for a day-long training. Materials were passed out to the teachers at this time. In spring 1998, she trained some of the original ten teachers to conduct more teacher training sessions for the 1998-99 school year. Mattioli makes an effort to keep in touch with Project Citizen teachers throughout the year.[3]

No competitions have been held and none are planned for the 1997-98 school year. The only funding for Project Citizen in Tennessee is the $500 grant from the Center for Civic Education.

---

[1] Mattioli interviews, October 13, 1997, and February 10, 1998.

[2] Mattioli interview, February 10, 1998.

[3] Mattioli interivews, October 13, 1997, and February 10, 1998.

TEXAS

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Mark Freeman, Administrative Assistant	
Law-Related Education State Bar of Texas P.O. Box 12487, Suite 607 Austin, Texas 78711-2487	
Phone: 512-463-1463 (ext. 2120)	Fax: 512-475-1904
E-Mail: wolfs.den@mail.utexas.edu	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first implemented in Texas in the beginning of the 1997-98 school year. A total of 28 Project Citizen books have been distributed to teachers across Texas. As of this writing, two teachers were reported to have been using the program. In March 1998, LRE held a Project Citizen workshop during its annual Law-Related Education conference in which 15 teachers were provided an overview of Project Citizen. Texas held its first Project Citizen competition in May 1998.

Texas' Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1997	Est. Teachers Using Since 1997	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1997-98	15	2	May 1	No	No	Yes	No

The Project Citizen program is administered through the Law-Related Education (LRE) office of the State Bar of Texas. LRE is also responsible for the administration of *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. Mark Freeman, a full-time graduate student at The University of Texas at Austin and a part-time employee at Law-Related Education (LRE), is the Project Citizen State Coordinator. Freeman assumed the role of state coordinator in October 1997 upon the departure of the previous LRE Director and former Project Citizen state coordinator. However, neither he nor the previous coordinator received any formal training on how to train teachers to implement Project Citizen in the classroom. Freeman receives assistance in coordinating the Project Citizen program from other Law-Related Education staff, primarily in the form of administrative support.

Freeman generally markets the Project Citizen program through blanket mailings, LRE newsletters, word of mouth, and LRE conferences. Freeman's efforts for the 1997-98 school year have consisted mainly of recruiting a "starter crop" of teachers who can help spread information about the program. Freeman sent mailings describing the program to every middle school social studies curriculum coordinator Texas early in the school year.[1] This resulted in 20 teachers requesting Project Citizen books.

More recently Freeman has begun to use other recruitment strategies. LRE is developing a web site, which will provide teachers with information related to all LRE programs and activities, including Project Citizen.[2] Additionally, teacher and Project Citizen user Norm Goldberg has been actively involved in recruiting teachers to use Project Citizen. Goldberg presented information on the program at a Texas Middle School Association meeting in San Antonio, Texas.

As of this writing, Texas has not offered any formal training sessions for teachers to learn how to implement Project Citizen in the classroom. However, on March 6, 1998, LRE sponsored a statewide conference in Austin, Texas, showcasing its various programs. One of the workshops was dedicated to Project Citizen. It was led by Goldberg, a teacher from San Antonio who used the program earlier that year. The workshop provided a basic introduction to Project Citizen to 15 educators from around the state. During this session students from Goldberg's Project Citizen class presented their class portfolio.

Given the success of the program in San Antonio, Freeman encouraged teachers with Project Citizen materials to have their students participate in a statewide portfolio competition scheduled for May 1, 1998. All teachers who received Project Citizen materials within the past year were invited to participate in this competition. Ten classes are expected to participate. Portfolios will be displayed in the State Bar of Texas building, which is located in Austin, the state capital. Freeman will rely on LRE's usual network of court judges to judge the portfolios.

LRE provides in-kind support to Project Citizen through LRE funding sources already in place. Furthermore, since LRE is a program of the State Bar of Texas and also is located adjacent to the State Capitol, LRE has an established network of judges and other members of the legal community who can serve as resources for Project Citizen-related activities. Targeting the Texas Legislature for program funding does not appear to be part of LRE's fund-raising strategy.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Maria Gutierrez with Mark Freeman, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Austin, Texas, October 9, 1997.
[2] Ibid.

VERMONT

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Richard Long, Teacher	
P.O. Box 212 1 Clark Court, Saxtons River, VT 05154	
Phone: 802-722-3336	Fax: 802-722-3174
E-Mail: rlkb@sover.net	

Status of Implementation

Vermont began promoting Project Citizen in 1996-97. Since 1996-97, approximately nine teachers have used Project Citizen in their classrooms and no teachers have received Project Citizen training. No Project Citizen competitions or hearings have been held in Vermont.[1]

Vermont's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	0	9	None	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of Richard Long, Project Citizen state coordinator for Vermont. Long is also a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinator and a full-time teacher. Long receives no administrative assistance to implement Project Citizen.[2]

Teacher outreach and marketing activities have included the distribution of Project Citizen materials and information by Long at a Vermont state social studies teachers conference in 1997. No Project Citizen teacher trainings or competitions have been held in Vermont. Vermont does not receive any Project Citizen support outside of the $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Richard Long, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Saxtons River, Vermont, April 2, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

VIRGINIA

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Helen Coalter, Teacher	
George Wythe High School 12904 Acorn Hill Court Midlothian, Virginia 23112-4800	
Phone: (804) 744-6456	Fax: (804) 780-5043
E-Mail: None	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen is in the early stages of implementation in Virginia, but there is great potential for growth. The program is a perfect fit with the state's new recommendations for service learning. Since its inception under the Disney Project in 1995, there has been a steady increase of teachers who have used the program. There have been training sessions, and a yearly distribution of books. There have been 68 teachers trained since 1995, but no competition has been held thus far. An estimated 17 teachers have used Project Citizen in Virginia since 1995.

Virginia's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1995	Est. Teachers Using Since 1995	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1995-96	68	17	May	No	No	No	No

Project Citizen implementation is handled by Helen Coalter, who is a teacher at George Wythe High School in Virginia. She has taught for 19 years and is also the state coordinator for *We The People... The Citizen and the Constitution*. Coalter receives no assistance administering the program in Virginia.

Coalter targets many different kinds of teachers for Project Citizen. She contacts them at conferences, by word of mouth, through recruitment letters, and through newsletters. At state conferences, Coalter and two other teachers, Betsy Ivey and Carolyn Turner, conduct the training sessions. Trainings consist of walk-throughs of Project Citizen, information about the Center for Civic Education and "how to" sessions for teaching Project Citizen. Coalter keeps in touch with those teachers whom she has trained by way of letters and follow-up calls. Since 1995, there have been 68 teachers trained.

In previous years, there have been no competitions. This year, 1997-98, if there is a desire to participate in a competition on the part of those teachers who have used Project Citizen, one will be held in late May 1998.[1]

Outside of the $500 received annually from the Center for Civic Education, there is no funding from groups or individuals for Project Citizen. Grace and Holy Trinity Church has donated space for competitions. One class in Dayton raised money for its Project Citizen portfolio by hosting a dance. The money raised went to the local homeless shelter, which was the topic of its portfolio.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Suzie Meltz with Helen Coalter, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Midlothian, Virginia, March 31, 1998.

WASHINGTON

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Kathy Hand, Independent Consultant	
560 South 158th Street Seattle, WA 98148-1205	
Phone: 206-244-3463	Fax: 206-244-4247
E-Mail: hand@psia-nw.org	

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Washington in 1996-97. During the past two years, approximately 20 teachers have been trained, but only six are believed to be currently using the program.[1] It is anticipated that this year four classes will submit entries for a state-level portfolio competition that will take place in June 1998. The state coordinator has not been able to persuade the state's legislators to fund Project Citizen, and gaining endorsement and support for Project Citizen from key government agencies and community-based civic education organizations is in its early stages.

Washington's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	20	6	June	No	No	Yes	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Kathy Hand. Hand is a teacher, education administrator, and political activist, currently employed as an independent consultant. Hand has been affiliated with the civic education programs of the Center for Civic Education (CCE) for the past ten years and also serves as the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator. Although Hand is not linked with any organization to help administer Project Citizen, she does receive considerable networking assistance from the nine *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* congressional district coordinators, in addition to help from teachers and others.[2]

Hand's outreach efforts strive to reach teachers, education administrators, and political representatives statewide. Her marketing strategy includes attending conferences, as well as using recruitment letters, telephone calls, and personal meetings. Hand has found that recruiting teachers directly is the most effective way to actually get teachers to use Project Citizen.[3] She uses the Education Service Districts' mailing service to send out notifications about CCE programs. Middle school social studies teachers are primarily targeted for recruitment, though Project Citizen materials are also being used in alternative learning settings, such as in a drug and alcohol rehabilitation program and with learning-disabled youth.[1]

---

[1] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Kathy Hand, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Seattle, Washington, February 26, 1998.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

In spring 1997, Hand had a booth at the Curriculum and Instruction Conference that is attended by book vendors. In November 1997, she had a booth at the State School Directors Conference that is attended by school board members and superintendents. At both, she gave away the different *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program books as a strategy to gain legitimization from education administrators that the programs fulfill the state's student learning objectives.[2] The CCE developed a correlation guide that reflects how Washington's social studies standards are met using all the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* programs, and this is used as a marketing tool.

Hand is the key contact for anyone wanting to register for Project Citizen teacher training sessions she organizes. Approximately 20 teachers throughout the state have been trained to use Project Citizen since 1996. Ten sets of books have been distributed in the state, and recently Hand has paid greater attention to follow-up with teachers once they have participated in training and received Project Citizen materials. Generally, the teacher training is an informative session about the CCE and a review or walk-through of Project Citizen and other *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program materials. Although nobody in the state has been formally trained as a teacher trainer, two people in addition to Hand are capable trainers: Christy Ulrich and Beneva Link, teachers who have successfully used Project Citizen in their classes.[3] To date, no evaluation of teacher training sessions has occurred. In the future, Hand hopes to see Project Citizen training run as a two-day, interactive "how to" training session.

In 1996-97, one portfolio was produced, and it was sent to the national competition in Philadelphia. In 1997-98, it is not anticipated that simulated hearings will occur in the state, but four classes likely will submit entries for the June 1998 state portfolio competition. Hand has an idea to ask media people to judge the competition to gain mileage on promoting Project Citizen.[4] As use of the program increases and additional funding is secured, Hand hopes to hold simulated hearings in seven regional areas of the state and pay for travel expenses for classes to participate.[5]

In 1997, Hand began a long process of lobbying the state's legislators to gain political and financial support for Project Citizen, which has yet to take shape. Her plan is to secure funds to pilot Project Citizen in five school districts and then showcase the results to generate support and recruitment of more teachers statewide. At this time, Hand has gained in-kind contributions for Project Citizen in the form of release time from the school district for teacher Ulrich, who led a teacher training session in March 1998.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

It is noteworthy that Project Citizen received special attention on February 17, 1998, when U.S. Secretary of Education Riley made his annual State of Education address in a Seattle school and referred to Project Citizen. Thanks to State Representative Adam Smith who provided Hand tickets for the event, three students whose sixth-grade class has used Project Citizen and their parents were able to participate as audience members.

WISCONSIN

State Coordinator Contact Information

Alfred L. Block, Education for Employment

South Milwaukee High School
7211 South Scherrei Drive
Franklin, WI 53132

Phone: 414-768-6384 | Fax: 414-768-6400

E-Mail: none

Status of Implementation

Project Citizen was first introduced in Wisconsin in 1996-97. The start of Project Citizen implementation in Wisconsin has been modest, but positive. Some 25 teachers have been trained since 1996. Eight social studies teachers used Project Citizen in the 1996-1997 school year; three classes (one teacher) participated in a simulated hearing, and the winning portfolio advanced to the national portfolio competition. As the program grows, it is likely that simulated hearings will take place in the state's nine congressional districts, with the winning classes advancing to a state-level hearing competition.

Wisconsin's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	25	9	June 15	Yes	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of the state coordinator, Alfred Block. Block is a long-time educator and education administrator and is currently the head of Education for Employment at South Milwaukee High School. Affiliated with the Center for Civic Education (CCE) education programs for many years, Block also serves as the *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* state coordinator. Although Block is not linked with any organization that could help administer Project Citizen, he does receive considerable networking assistance from the nine *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* congressional district coordinators, in addition to help from teachers and others.[1] Block is the key contact for anyone wanting to register for Project Citizen teacher training sessions he organizes.

Block is responsible for Project Citizen marketing and outreach strategies in the state. Outreach efforts are directed at recruiting social studies, civics, and government teachers; friends of the state coordinator and district coordinators; teachers using other CCE programs; experienced and new teachers; and those participating in teacher in-service workshops. Block uses conferences, recruitment letters, word of mouth, and congressional district coordinators to contact teachers. In its statewide newsletter, the Wisconsin Council of Social Studies sent members information about CCE programs.[1] Information about CCE civic education program materials has been provided to the state's 12 regional cooperative service agencies for further distribution, as well as to the *We the People... The Citizen and Constitution* congressional district coordinators.[2] Block's goal for 1997-98 is to have a minimum of one school in each congressional district participate in a state-level portfolio competition.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Vivita Rozenbergs with Alfred Block, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Franklin, Wisconsin, February 27, 1998.

A mailing was sent to 1,200 schools announcing the Council for Social Studies convention on March 18, 1998, that specifically mentioned that Project Citizen and *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* program information would be available in a break-out session for middle school and high school teachers.[3] It seems that the direct, first class mailing is the most effective method used to recruit teachers. Mostly middle school teachers have responded and expressed interest about Project Citizen, then elementary school teachers, with high school teachers responding less often.

Project Citizen fulfills the state's social studies standards, which were only recently approved. Since Project Citizen helps teachers meet state curriculum requirements for middle school, this strategy is used considerably to encourage teachers to use it.

Teacher training is organized by Block and consists of an informative session about CCE, an overview of Project Citizen, a review of Project Citizen classroom materials, and a "how to" session for teaching Project Citizen, in addition to an overview of state standards as they relate to Project Citizen. An estimated 25 teachers have been trained (15 in 1996-97, and 10 in 1997-98, up until February 1998). In March 1997, a CCE employee led the first information session in the Milwaukee area during the Wisconsin Council for Social Studies convention. Although nobody in the state has been formally trained as a teacher trainer, Block, as well as Walt Herscher and Mary Lindgren, both *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* congressional district coordinators, have served as teacher trainers.[4] Block will attend this year's social studies convention in March and lead the Project Citizen break-out session.

In 1996-97, three classrooms (one teacher) produced portfolios and defended their work at a simulated hearing judged by a congressional district coordinator. The winning team's portfolio was sent to the national competition in 1997. To date, portfolios have not been displayed publicly in Wisconsin. At this time, it is not known how many classes are using Project Citizen or will participate in the portfolio competition that will take place on June 15, 1998.[5] It is hoped that a minimum of one school from each of the nine congressional districts will be represented. Judges of this year's state portfolio competition have not yet been confirmed. As the Project Citizen program grows throughout the state, Block hopes to organize district-level simulated hearings, with the leading classes advancing to a state-level hearing.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.

Project Citizen has not received any additional financial support at the state level. In 1997, interest was generated among the state's legislators when an article promoting Project Citizen was printed in the newsletter of the National Conference of State Legislatures. Block followed up with informative meetings with three legislative staffers.[1] At this time, though, Project Citizen has not received endorsement at the state level, as the political atmosphere in the state legislature is politically polarized, making budgetary appropriations arduous.[2] Limited funding by CCE limits the implementation schedule of Project Citizen in the state, and the program will remain modest until additional funding is available.[3] As for in-kind contributions, the congressional district coordinators have provided leadership, program promotion, and judging assistance.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

WYOMING

State Coordinator Contact Information	
Kevin Cates, Teacher	
1501 Oak Court Cheyenne, WY 82001	
Phone: 307-634-9777	Fax: 307-771-2661
E-Mail: none	

Status of Implementation

Wyoming began promoting Project Citizen in 1996-97. Since 1996-97, an estimated two teachers have used Project Citizen in their classrooms and six teachers have received Project Citizen training. No Project Citizen competitions or hearings have been held in Wyoming.[1]

Wyoming's Project Citizen Program at a Glance

Year Project Citizen First Used	Est. Teachers Trained Since 1996	Est. Teachers Using Since 1996	Date of 1998 Competition	State Hearings?	State Funding?	Other Funding?	Advisory Committee?
1996-97	6	2	None	No	No	No	No

Implementation of Project Citizen is the responsibility of Kevin Cates, Project Citizen state coordinator for Wyoming. Cates is also a *We the People... The Citizen and the Constitution* district coordinator and a full-time junior high school teacher. Cates receives no administrative assistance to implement Project Citizen.[2]

Teacher outreach and marketing activities have included an information and training session on Project Citizen conducted by Cates at a Wyoming state teachers conference in October 1996. Teacher trainings have included an information and training session on Project Citizen conducted by Cates at a Wyoming state teachers conference in October 1996. Approximately six teachers have received Project Citizen training in Wyoming since 1996-97.[3]

No Project Citizen competitions or hearings have been held in Wyoming. Wyoming does not receive any support for Project Citizen outside of the $500 stipend provided by the Center for Civic Education.

---

[1] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Kevin Cates, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cheyenne, Wyoming, April 2, 1998.

[2] Telephone interview by Sarah Wheat with Kevin Cates, Project Citizen State Coordinator, Cheyenne, Wyoming, October 7, 1997.

[3] Cates interviews, October 7, 1997, and April 2, 1998.

Appendix B. Project Citizen State Coordinator Contact List

Doug Phillips
Social Studies Program Coordinator
Anchorage School District
P.O. Box 196614
Anchorage, AK 99519-6614
W: (907) 269-2210 Fax: (907) 269-2325
E-Mail: phillips_doug@msmail.asd.k12.ak.us

Lynda Rando
Director, Center for Law-Related Education
Arizona Bar Foundation
111 W. Monroe, Suite 1800
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1742
W: (602) 340-7360 Fax: (602) 271-4930
E-Mail: rando.l@azbar.org

Barbara Miller
Director, Colorado Civic/Legal Educ. Prog.
Social Science Education Consortium
P.O. Box 21270
Denver, CO 80308
W: (303) 778-7441 Fax: (303) 778-0992
E-Mail: millerba@stripe.colorado.edu

Lewis Huffman
State Social Studies Director
State of Delaware, Dept. of Public Instruction
Townsend Bldg., P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903
W: (302) 739-4647 Fax: (302) 739-4483
E-Mail: None

Michele Collins
Assistant Principal
Ashworth Middle School
333 New Town Rd.
Calhoun, GA 30701
W: (706) 625-9545 Fax: (706) 625-0114
E-Mail: None

Wade Black
Associate Director
Ala. Center for Law and Civic Education
800 Lakeshore Drive
Birmingham, AL 35229
W: (205) 870-2433 Fax: (205) 870-2459
E-Mail: None

Roy Erickson
Director, Justice Education Programs
Center for Civic Education
4808 Runway Drive
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
W: (916) 863-6614 Fax: (916) 863-6551
E-Mail: cacoord@aol.com

James Schmidt
Executive Director
Ct. Consortium for Law,Citizenship and Educ.
P.O. Box 150470
Hartford, CT 06115-0470
W: (860) 509-6184 Fax: (860) 509-6187
E-Mail: None

Annette Boyd Pitts
Executive Director
Florida Law-Related Education Assn., Inc.
1625 Metropolitan Circle, Suite B
Tallahassee, FL 32308
W: (850) 386-8223 Fax: (850) 386-8292
E-Mail: ABPflreaED@aol.com

Sharon Kaohi
Dir., Soc. Stud. Curr. Area
OASIS School Renewal Group, Hawaii Dept. of Ed
189 Lunalilo Home Road, 2nd Floor
Honolulu, HI 96825
W: (808) 394-1331 Fax: (808) 394-1304
E-Mail: sharon_kaohi@notes.k12.hi.us

Linda Martin
Program Consultant
Area Education Agency Seven
3712 Cedar Heights Dr.
Cedar Falls, IA 50613
W: (319) 273-8215 Fax: (319) 273-8219
E-Mail: None

Michael Radz
Asst. Superintendent for Instructional Services
Community High School District 218
10701 S. Kilpatrick Ave.
Oaklawn, IL 60453
W: (708) 424-2000 Fax: (708) 424-7361
E-Mail: mradz@d218.edu

Richard Leighty
Program Consultant
4726 SE 21st St., P.O. Box 126
Tecumseh, KS 66542-0126
W: (785) 379-5779 Fax: None
E-Mail: None

John Alexander
Social Studies Coordinator
Jefferson Parish Public Schools
501 Manhattan St.
Harvey, LA 70058-4443
W: (504) 349-7883 Fax: (504) 349-8906
E-Mail: None

James Adomanis
Director
Md. Center for the Study of Hist. and Civic Edu.
541 Norton Lane, Suite B
Arnold, MD 21012-2359
W: (410) 974-4680 Fax: (410) 222-5608
E-Mail: mcshce27@annap.infi.net

Dan Prinzing
Teacher
Les Bois Junior High School
701 East Boise Ave.
Boise, ID 83706
W: (208) 336-9896 Fax: (208) 338-3691
E-Mail: dprinzin@micron.net

Lynn Nelson
Associate Professor and Director
Ackerman Ctr. for Democratic Cit., Purdue Univ.
1442 Liberal Arts and Education Bldg., Rm. 4115A
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1442
W: (765) 494-2372 Fax: (765) 496-2210
E-Mail: lrnelson@omni.cc.purdue.edu

Tracey Sharpe
Court Designated Worker, Juvenile Svcs. Division
Admin. Office of the Courts, State of Kentucky
212 1/2 N. 20th St., Suite 2
Middlesboro, KY 40965
W: (606) 248-5811 Fax: None
E-Mail: tracey@urgentmail.com

Barbara Locurto
Director
IMPACT II Teacher Network
55 New Dudley Street, Bldg. #1
Boston, MA 02120
W: (617) 635-9440 Fax: (617) 635-6571
E-Mail: blocurto@boston.k12.ma.us

Pam Beal
Program Consultant
58 Sylvan Rd.
South Portland, ME 04106
W: (207) 767-2737 Fax: None
E-Mail: None

Linda Start
Executive Director
Center for Civic Education through Law
2100 Pontiac Lake Rd.
Waterford, MI 48328-2735
W: (248) 209-2347 Fax: None
E-Mail: linda.start@oakland.k12.mi.us

Lynette McBrayer
Director of Bar Services and Law-Related Educ.
Mississippi State Bar Assn.
P.O. Box 2168
Jackson, MS 39225-2168
W: (601) 948-4471 Fax: (601) 355-8635
E-Mail: mcbrayer@msbar.org

Pamela Riley
Director
N.C. Center for the Prevention of School Violence
20 Enterprise Street, Suite 2
Raleigh, NC 27607-7375
W: (919) 515-9397 Fax: (919) 515-9561
E-Mail: pamela_riley@ncsu.edu

Evelyn Taraszkiewicz
Director of Social Studies K-12
Bayonne Board of Education
Ave. A & 28th Street
Bayonne, NJ 07002
W: (201) 858-5921 Fax: (201) 858-6248
E-Mail: None

Judith Simpson
Coordinator
Partners in Education, Inc.
861 East Glendale Ave.
Sparks, NV 89431
W: (702) 353-5533 Fax: (702) 353-5536
E-Mail: judithsimpson@hotmail.com

Roger Wangen
Program Consultant
3928 Xerxes Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN 55410
W: (612) 920-2639 Fax: (612) 922-8755
E-Mail: nrwangen@mn.uswest.net

Sally Broughton
Teacher
10663 Bridger Canyon Rd.
Bozeman, MT 59715
W: (406) 585-3544 Fax: None
E-Mail: None

Tom Keefe
Director, Law-Related Education
Nebraska State Bar Assn.
635 S. 14th St., Suite 200
Lincoln, NE 68501-1809
W: (402) 475-7091 Fax: (402) 475-7098
E-Mail: nsbasn05@nol.org

Dora Marroquin
Teacher Consultant
11600 Academy Rd. NE, Apt. 1311
Albuquerque, NM 87111
W: (505) 299-2510 Fax: None
E-Mail: bdjlglm@earthlink.net

Stephen Schechter
Executive Director
Council for Cit. Educ., Russell Sage College
45 Ferry Street
Troy, NY 12180
W: (518) 244-2363 Fax: (518) 244-3125
E-Mail: schecs@sage.edu

Libby Cupp
Economic & Career Educ. Coordinator
Apollo Career Center
3325 Shawnee Road
Lima, OH 45806-1454
W: (419) 998-2984 Fax: (419) 998-2994
E-Mail: ap_cupp@noacsc.ohio.gov

Marilyn Cover
Executive Director
Classroom Law Project
6318 SW Corbett
Portland, OR 97201
W: (503) 245-8707 Fax: (503) 245-8538
E-Mail: cover@lclark.edu

Henry Cote
Director, Ch. I and Ch. II
Pawtucket School District
Administration Building, Park Place
Pawtucket, RI 02860
W: (401) 729-6376 Fax: (401) 729-6546
E-Mail: None

Mark Rockafellow
Principal
Marion High School
P.O. Box 207
Marion, SD 57043
W: (605) 648-3615 Fax: (605) 648-3652
E-Mail: rockm@gwtc.net

Mark Freeman
Law-Related Education
State Bar of Texas
P.O. Box 12487, Suite 607
Austin, TX 78711-2487
W: (512) 463-1463 Fax: (512) 475-1904
E-Mail: wolfs.den@mail.utexas.edu

Michael Reggio
Law-Related Educ. State Coordinator
Oklahoma Bar Association
P.O. Box 53036
Oklahoma City, OK 73152
W: (405) 524-7005 Fax: (405) 524-1115
E-Mail: mreggio@aardvark.ucs.ou.edu

Lon Weber
Senior Vice President for Education
Freedoms Foundation
P.O. Box 706, 1601 Valley Forge Rd.
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0706
W: (800) 896-5488 Fax: (610) 935-0522
E-Mail: lweber@ffvf.org

Cindy Coker
Law-Related Education Director
South Carolina Bar
P.O. Box 608
Columbia, SC 29202
W: (803) 252-5139 Fax: (803) 799-4118
E-Mail: cindy.coker@scbar.org

Denee Mattioli
Professor
East Tennessee State University
Rural Route II, Box 1965
Elizabeth, TN 34643
W: (423) 439-4203 Fax: (423) 439-8362
E-Mail: mattioli@access.etsu-tn.edu

Rulon Garfield
Program Consultant
3050 Apache Lane
Provo, UT 84604
W: (801) 377-0869 Fax: (801) 373-3674
E-Mail: None

Helen Coalter
Teacher
George Wythe High School
12904 Acorn Hill Court
Midlothian, VA 23112-4800
W: (804) 744-6456 Fax: (804) 780-5043
E-Mail: None

Kathy Hand
Independant Consultant
560 South 158th Street
Seattle, WA 98148-1205
W: (206) 244-3463 Fax: (206) 244-4247
E-Mail: hand@psia-nw.org

Kevin Cates
Teacher
1501 Oak Court
Cheyenne, WY 82001
W: (307) 634-9777 Fax: (307) 771-2661
E-Mail: None

Richard Long
Teacher
P.O. Box 212, 1 Clark Court
Saxtons River, VT 05154
W: (802) 722-3336 Fax: (802) 722-3174
E-Mail: rlkb@sover.net

Alfred Block
Education for Employment
South Milwaukee High School
7211 South Scherrei Drive
Franklin, WI 53132
W: (414) 768-6384 Fax: (414) 768-6400
E-Mail: None

Appendix C. *We the People... Project Citizen* Evaluation Plan

Through a nine-month Policy Research Project (PRP), the LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, will conduct an evaluation of *We the People... Project Citizen* for the Center for Civic Education from September 1997 through August 1998.

We the People... Project Citizen is a civic education program for middle school students. Administered by the Center with cooperation from the National Conference of State Legislatures, Project Citizen is intended to foster students' interest and ability to participate in policymaking. Project Citizen materials help students learn how to monitor and influence public policy; learn policy making processes; develop concrete skills and the foundation needed to become responsible citizens; develop effective, creative communication skills; and develop more positive self-images and confidence in exercising the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

The LBJ School's PRP research team consists of 15 graduate students with substantial professional experiences in diverse public, private, and nonprofit organizations. Under the direction of Professor Kenneth Tolo, the PRP is a major part of the LBJ School's interdisciplinary, practitioner-focused research program.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation is designed to identify conditions and practices that promote the adoption, implementation, and expansion of Project Citizen in the states. Specifically, the evaluation will

- assess the extent Project Citizen is being used by students nationwide;
- identify factors that have promoted adoption and implementation of the program;
- identify opportunities for and barriers to implementing and expanding the program;
- document teacher and student perceptions of the effects of Project Citizen; and
- present recommendations for improving Project Citizen's effectiveness.

Research Objectives

The specific research questions to be investigated include:

RQ1

To what extent is Project Citizen used nationwide? How many schools, classes, and students are participating in Project Citizen? What are the demographic characteristics of participating schools and classes?

RQ2

a. *What are the elements of the Project Citizen organizational structure that lead to successful implementation of the program? What barriers do state coordinators encounter in implementing and expanding Project Citizen?*

b. *What strategies are used by the Center for Civic Education and Project Citizen state coordinators to solicit teacher participation? Which have been most successful?*

c. *To what extent are civic leaders, business representatives, state legislators, and parents involved in Project Citizen? What factors encourage their involvement? What kinds of financial and in-kind support do they commit to the program?*

RQ3

How are teachers integrating Project Citizen into their curricula? Which elements of the program are used (i.e., portfolio, competition, booklet)? Do teachers have sufficient interest in civic participation to teach Project Citizen? What do teachers perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?

RQ4

On what types of public policy problems do students choose to focus? Are student policy recommendations adopted and implemented? If so, how?

RQ5

How do students perceive their participation in Project Citizen? How do teachers perceive the effects of Project Citizen on students? Does Project Citizen raise student awareness, understanding of, and participation in public policy issues in their communities and states?

Research Methodologies and Data Sources

Information to address RQ1-RQ5 will be gathered from all 45 states with a designated Project Citizen state coordinator. Researchers will collect this data primarily through written surveys and telephone interviews. In addition, to better analyze the conditions and practices that have led to successful implementation in several key states, researchers will travel to a minimum of seven states to meet with state coordinators, teachers, students, civic leaders, state legislators, and others. When possible, researchers will observe simulated hearings, teacher training sessions, and class demonstrations; administer on-site surveys; and facilitate student focus groups in these states.

Each state research team will consist of two project members. State visits will typically last two to three days.

These states will be chosen based on discussion with Center staff and such criteria as follows: number of classes in the state currently participating in the program; number of classes producing portfolios; conduct of a statewide competition; commitment of the state coordinator to program implementation and expansion; efforts to solicit private and/or public financial support for the program; conduct of teacher training sessions; and extent of participation by community leaders.

The following are the specific methodologies that will be used to investigate each question:

RQ1

To what extent is Project Citizen used nationwide? How many schools, teachers, classes, and students are participating in Project Citizen in each state? What are the demographic characteristics of participating schools and classes?

The school demographics to be studied include public/private, grade configuration, and ethnic composition.

The class demographics to be studied include grade level, class size, subject of instruction, level of instruction (e.g., gifted and talented, regular, remedial), and ethnic composition.

This question is intended to provide a snapshot of how many students, classes, teachers, and schools are participating in Project Citizen in each state. Data will be collected for each of the following years: 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98.

Information to address RQ1 will be gathered from all states with a Project Citizen state coordinator. To the extent possible, researchers will gather this information from state coordinators. Data will be obtained through telephone interviews and written surveys. In the event that state coordinators cannot provide this data, researchers will contact participating schools and teachers who are identified by state coordinators and by the list of those individuals who received Project Citizen materials from the Center.

RQ2

a. *What are the elements of the Project Citizen organizational structure that lead to successful implementation of the program? What barriers do state coordinators encounter in implementing and expanding Project Citizen?*

b. *What strategies are used by the Center for Civic Education and Project Citizen state coordinators to solicit teacher participation? Which have been most successful?*

c. *To what extent are civic leaders, business representatives, state legislators, and parents involved in Project Citizen? What factors encourage their involvement? What kinds of financial and in-kind support do they commit to the program?*

Information to address RQs 2a, 2b, and 2c will be gathered from all states with a Project Citizen state coordinator. Initial data will be gathered through telephone interviews and written surveys with state coordinators, civic leaders, state legislators, business representatives, and teachers. For states included in our sample for in-depth study, researchers will supplement telephone interviews and written surveys with personal interviews and site visits.

RQ3

How are teachers integrating Project Citizen into their curricula? Which elements of the program are used (i.e., portfolio, competition, booklet)? Do teachers have sufficient interest in civic participation to teach Project Citizen? What do teachers perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program?

Information to address RQ3 will be collected primarily from teachers through telephone interviews and written surveys. For those states visited, researchers will also conduct personal interviews with teachers and, if possible, observe classes participating in Project Citizen.

RQ4

On what types of public policy problems do students choose to focus? Are student policy recommendations adopted and implemented? If so, how?

Researchers will gather information to address this question primarily through state coordinators and participating teachers, who will be asked to identify additional sources of this information (e.g., news clippings, school newsletters, community leaders). For the states selected for in-depth study, researchers will also attempt to examine student portfolios and observe simulated hearings during site visits to the states.

RQ5

How do students perceive their participation in Project Citizen? How do teachers perceive the effects of Project Citizen on students? Does Project Citizen raise student awareness, understanding of, and participation in public policy issues in their communities and states?

To assess the effects of the program on students' skills, attitudes, understanding, and participation, researchers will gather data primarily through personal interviews and on-site surveys, class observations, and focus groups. For states researchers do not visit, limited information will be obtained through telephone interviews with teachers.

Responsibilities of the PRP and the Center

The timely completion of deliverables by the PRP is necessarily contingent upon timely provision of accurate, accessible information from the Center, state coordinators, and teachers.

The Center will provide to the PRP all appropriate and available information and insights on Project Citizen that would enable the PRP to conduct its evaluation. This information and assistance would include, but not be limited to

- updated lists of state coordinators, teachers, and others involved in Project Citizen in the states;
- copies of relevant correspondence (e.g., recruiting/marketing/training materials) between the Center and state coordinators;
- copies of Project Citizen advertising and promotional materials distributed by the Center;

- copies of all Project Citizen implementation plans prepared and submitted by state coordinators;
- dates and substance of Project Citizen competitions and teacher training sessions in the states, to the extent they are known;
- a list of all Project Citizen awareness/training sessions conducted or scheduled by the Center in any of the states during the past two years; and
- assistance in obtaining active cooperation and documentation from Project Citizen state coordinators and teachers.

The PRP expects that Project Citizen state coordinators and teachers will assist researchers in arranging and coordinating interviews with other teachers, civic leaders, state legislators, and students in their respective states. State coordinator leadership will be particularly important in states which researchers visit. The study will be limited by the extent that these state coordinators share responsibility for the evaluation with the PRP and the Center and provide accurate, up-to-date information about the implementation of Project Citizen in their state.

The PRP will conduct the evaluation in a manner that supports the Center's programmatic mission and activities and is consistent with the terms of this evaluation plan. This plan may be modified in writing as jointly determined by the Center and PRP.

Project Deliverables

The PRP will provide the following deliverables:

- quarterly status reports by December 1, 1997 and March 1, 1998;
- a draft report of findings and recommendations for review by June 1, 1998; and
- a final report of findings and recommendations (300 copies) by September 30, 1998.

Appendix D. Project Citizen State Coordinator Survey: November 1997

PROJECT CITIZEN SURVEY - INFORMATION ABOUT STATE AND STATE COORDINATOR

Please complete the following information about yourself and your state's Project Citizen program. Return this survey, along with a copy of your Project Citizen Implementation Plan, by November 4, 1997, to Professor Ken Tolo, 512-471-1835 (fax), or use the self-addressed envelope enclosed with this survey.

Name:		
Address:		
Telephone:	Fax:	E-Mail:
Are you the coordinator for We the People...Citizen and the Constitution? Yes No	Year your state first began implementing Project Citizen:	

Does your state hold Project Citizen competitions? Yes No If yes, how many, and at what levels (i.e. local or state?)
Does your state hold Project Citizen simulated hearings? Yes No If yes, are they separate from or a part of a competition?
Do you have any Project Citizen teacher training sessions scheduled in 1997-98? Yes No If yes, please provide the dates and locations:
Do you have any other Project Citizen events scheduled for 1997-98? (i.e. competitions, simulated hearings, portfolio exhibitions, etc.) Yes No If yes, please list the event, date, and location:
Do you have a completed Project Citizen implementation plan for 1997-98? Yes No If yes, please include a copy with this completed survey.

Please turn to page 2 to provide information on the use of Project Citizen by teachers in your state.

PROJECT CITIZEN SURVEY-- INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHER AND CLASS USE

Instructions

1) ***Please provide information about EACH TEACHER in your state who HAS USED, IS USING, OR WILL USE Project Citizen in their class.***
2) ***If a teacher has used, is using, or will use Project Citizen in more than one class, please use a separate line to provide information for each class.***
3) ***If you do not know an answer, please indicate "DK." If the question is not applicable, please indicate "NA."***
4) ***Please print or type this form. If you need more lines, please copy this form.***
5) ***Fax this completed form to Ken Tolo at 512-471-1835, or return it in the self-addressed envelope provided with this survey. Thank you!***

Teacher and Class Use of Project Citizen

Teacher Name, Address, Phone, Fax	Year of Project Citizen Use (95-96, 96-97, 97-98)	School Name, Address, Phone, Fax	Is the School Public or Private?	Did/Will the Teacher Participate in Project Citizen Training? When?	Type of Class in which Project Citizen is used	What Public Policy Problem Did the Class Choose?	Did the Class Create a Portfolio?	Did Class Participate in a Competition or Hearing?

Please turn to page 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher and Class Use of Project Citizen

Teacher Name, Address, Phone, Fax	Year of Project Citizen Use (95-96, 96-97, 97-98)	School Name, Address, Phone, Fax	Is the School Public or Private?	Did/Will the Teacher Participate in Project Citizen Training? When?	Type of Class in which Project Citizen is used	What Public Policy Problem Did the Class Choose?	Did the Class Create a Portfolio?	Did Class Participate in a Competition or Hearing?

Not including the specific teachers you listed above, can you estimate the number of teachers and classes you anticipate will use Project Citizen in 1997-98? No. of Teachers: ____________ No. of Classes: ____________

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

PROJECT CITIZEN SURVEY-- INFORMATION ABOUT TEACHER AND CLASS USE

Instructions

1) ***Please provide information about EACH TEACHER in your state who HAS USED, IS USING, OR WILL USE Project Citizen in their class.***
2) ***If a teacher has used, is using, or will use Project Citizen in more than one class, please use a separate line to provide information for each class.***
3) ***If you do not know an answer, please indicate "DK." If the question is not applicable, please indicate "NA."***
4) ***Please print or type this form. If you need more lines, please copy this form.***
5) ***Fax this completed form to Ken Tolo at 512-471-1835, or return it in the self-addressed envelope provided with this survey. Thank you!***

Teacher and Class Use of Project Citizen

Teacher Name, Address, Phone, Fax	Year of Project Citizen Use (95-96, 96-97, 97-98)	School Name, Address, Phone, Fax	Is the School Public or Private?	Did/Will the Teacher Participate in Project Citizen Training? When?	Type of Class in which Project Citizen is used	What Public Policy Problem Did the Class Choose?	Did the Class Create a Portfolio?	Did Class Participate in a Competition or Hearing?
Amy Smith, 2345 W. Comell Rd., ustin, Texas 78705, 12-474-1111 phone, 512- 474- 000 fax	1995-96	Abemathy Middle School 3000 S. Congress, Austin, Texas 78746, 512-474-5333 phone, 512-474-0000 fax	Public	yes, May 1995	Social Studies	homelessness	yes	yes
my Smith, see above	1995-96	Abemathy Middle School, see above	Public	see above	Social Studies	speeding traffic	no	no
oe Boora, 0004 W. 39th, Austin, exas 78704, 512-474-1929 hone, 512-488-9088 fax	1996-97	Weatherby Junior High, 2000 S. First, Austin, Texas 78704, 512-488-9087 phone, 512-488-9088 fax	Public	yes, January 1996	English	graffiti prevention	yes	no
oe Boora, see above	1997-98	Weatherby Junior High, see above	Public	see above	Social Studies	NA	NA	NA
andy Sola, c/o St. Mary's chool, 1000 E. Ambleton St., aco, Texas 77006, 512-884- 000 phone, 512-884-9001 fax	1997-98	St. Mary's School, 1000 E. Ambleton St, Waco, Texas 77006, 512-884-9000 phone, 512-884-9001 fax	Private	will attend Dec. 97 training session	Social Studies	NA	NA	NA
ylvia Piaso, c/o St. Mary's chool, 1000 E. Ambleton St., aco, Texas 77006, 512-884- 000 phone, 512-884-9001 fax	1996-97	St. Mary's School, see above	Private	no	Social Studies	DK	no	no

lease turn to page 3

SAMPLE

Appendix E. Project Citizen State Coordinator Survey: December 1997

Survey Questions for the
Project Citizen State Coordinator

Your Name:____ State:________

Phone:___________________________ Fax:___________________________

Please return by: **Friday, December 19**
Please return this survey in attached envelope or fax to:
Kenneth Tolo, Professor and Project Director
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
University of Texas at Austin
Drawer Y
Austin, TX 78713-8925
FAX: 512-471-1835

Support from Center for Civic Education

1. Overall, how would you rate the responsiveness of the Center for Civic Education in meeting your needs for Project Citizen information, training, materials, etc.? (Please circle one.)

Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
1	2	3	4

2. How would you rate the responsiveness of the Center for Civic Education in the following areas: (Please circle one choice in each row.)

	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Providing Financial Support	1	2	3	4
Providing Teacher Training	1	2	3	4
Providing Project Citizen Materials	1	2	3	4
Providing Assistance with Recruiting Teachers	1	2	3	4
Providing Assistance to Secure Funding	1	2	3	4

3. Of the following areas of Project Citizen support from the Center for Civic Education, please rank their order of importance to the success of your program. (Rank the list below, 1 being the most important, 2 being second in importance, etc.)
   ___ Providing Financial Support
   ___ Providing Teacher Training
   ___ Providing Materials
   ___ Providing Assistance with Recruiting Teachers
   ___ Providing Assistance to Secure Funding

Project Citizen Administration

4. Do you have any assistance coordinating the Project Citizen program in your state?
   ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, who helps you coordinate? (Check all that apply.)
   ___ We the People State Coordinator
   ___ We the People District Coordinator
   ___ Friend
   ___ Individual Teacher
   ___ Someone hired for the specific purpose
   ___ Employee that works in your organization
   ___ Other (please indicate) ______________________________

5. On average, how many hours a week do you spend working on Project Citizen? (Please check one.)
   ___ 0
   ___ 1 - 5
   ___ 6 - 10
   ___ 11 - 15
   ___ 15 - 20
   ___ 20 or more

Outreach to Teachers/Schools

6. What methods do you use to inform teachers about Project Citizen? (Please check all that apply.)
   ___ Conferences

___ Recruitment Letter
___ Word of Mouth
___ Newsletters/Magazines
___ Other (please explain) ______________________________

7. Do you target certain types of teachers in your Project Citizen outreach efforts?
___ Yes ___ No

If yes, what are the types of teachers you target? (Please check all that apply.)
___ Friends of State Coordinator
___ Teachers using other Center for Civic Education Programs
___ Social Studies/Government Teachers
___ Experienced Teachers
___ New Teachers
___ Other (please explain) ______________________________

8. List Project Citizen training sessions by school year, by location and by lead presenter/affiliation. (Please fill in chart.)

School Year	Location	Lead Presenter/Affiliation

9. How many teachers have gone or will go through training, and how many of them have used or will use Project Citizen in their classrooms? (Please fill in chart.)

School Year	Number Trained	Number Implementing
1995-96		

1996-97		
1997-98		

10. What do teacher training sessions look like in your state? (Check all that apply.)

___ Informative sessions about the Center for Civic Education and overview of Project Citizen.
___ Review or "walk through" of Project Citizen classroom materials.
___ "How to" sessions for teaching Project Citizen in the classroom.
___ Forum for getting principal/school/community support.
___ Other (please explain)________________________________

11. To what extent do you think involving principals is necessary in expanding Project Citizen? (Please circle one.)

Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
1	2	3	4

12. Does Project Citizen help teachers meet state curriculum requirements for middle school social studies?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, do you use these requirements to encourage teachers to use Project Citizen? (Please circle one.)

Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
1	2	3	4

13. To what extent do you believe that the following factors cause teachers not to use Project Citizen? (Please circle one in each row.)

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
Time required in class	1	2	3	4
Time required outside class	1	2	3	4
Abilities of students	1	2	3	4
State curriculum requirements	1	2	3	4
District curriculum requirements	1	2	3	4
Lack of support from school administrator	1	2	3	4
Already have a successful method	1	2	3	4

of teaching civic education				
Training was inadequate	1	2	3	4
Not comfortable with subject matter	1	2	3	4
Other (please explain) ________________	1	2	3	4

14. To what extent do you believe that the following factors cause teachers who have used Project Citizen to stop using Project Citizen? (Please circle one in each row.)

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
Time required in class	1	2	3	4
Time required outside class	1	2	3	4
Abilities of students	1	2	3	4
State curriculum requirements	1	2	3	4
District curriculum requirements	1	2	3	4
Lack of support from school administrator	1	2	3	4
Already have a successful method of teaching civic education	1	2	3	4
Training was inadequate	1	2	3	4
Not comfortable with subject matter	1	2	3	4
Other (please explain) ________________	1	2	3	4

Competitions/Hearings

15. If you used judges for a Project Citizen simulated hearing or a portfolio competition, please list those individuals in the following table and provide the other information requested.

School Year	Name	Position/Affiliation	Phone Number

16. To what extent do you use Project Citizen competitions and/or portfolios to promote Project Citizen? (Please circle one.)

Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
1	2	3	4

Funding/Support

17. From which of the following sources has the Project Citizen program received in-kind or monetary support? (Please include name of source and amount or type of support received.)

State Legislature ______________________________

Center for Civic Education ______________________________

Non-profit Organization (please name) ______________________________

Business/Corporation (please name) ______________________________

Individual Donors (please name) ______________________________

Philanthropic Organizations (please name) ______________________________

Other (please name) ______________________________

18. Who are the people most supportive of Project Citizen in your state (e.g., civic leaders, business representatives, state legislators, parents)?

Name	Position/Affiliation	School Year of Support	Type of Support	Phone #

19. If you had unlimited time to commit to Project Citizen, on which additional activities would you focus?

20. Is there any other information about Project Citizen you would like to share?

Thank you! Please return by Friday, December 19, 1997 to:
Kenneth Tolo, Professor and Project Director
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
University of Texas at Austin
Drawer Y
Austin, TX 78713-8925
FAX: 512-471-1835

Appendix F. Project Citizen Teacher Survey: January 1998

PROJECT CITIZEN TEACHER SURVEY

Complete this survey by FEBRUARY 2, 1998, if you have been introduced to Project Citizen, but have not used and do not plan to use it in 1997-98.

Name: ______________________ Position: ______________________

School Name: ______________________ School District: ______________________

Address: ____

What is the best phone number at which to reach you? ______________________

What is the best time for you to receive phone calls? ______________________

Fax: ______________________ E-Mail: ______________________

1. How did you first hear about Project Citizen?
   ______ Through Center for Civic Education ______ Through Project Citizen State Coordinator
   ______ Through Another Teacher ______ Other (please explain): ______________

2. Have you received training on how to use Project Citizen in your classroom?
   _____ Yes (Answer questions 3-7) _____ No (Go to question 7)

3. When did you receive training? ____________ (Month) _______ (Year)

4. Where was the training and who conducted it?

5. What did the training look like? (Check all that apply.)

_____ Informative session about the Center for Civic Education and an overview of Project Citizen.
_____ Review or "walk through" of Project Citizen classroom materials.
_____ "How to" session for teaching Project Citizen in the classroom.
_____ Forum for getting principal/school/community support.
_____ Other (please explain): ____________________________________

6. How can Project Citizen training be improved?

7. To what extent did the following factors contribute to your decision **NOT** to implement Project Citizen in your classroom?

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
A. Time required in class	1	2	3	4
B. Time required outside of class	1	2	3	4
C. Abilities of students	1	2	3	4
D. State curricular requirements	1	2	3	4
E. District curricular requirements	1	2	3	4
F. Lack of support from school administration	1	2	3	4
G. Already have a successful method for teaching civics (please explain):	1	2	3	4
H. Training was inadequate to get started	1	2	3	4
I. Uncomfortable with the subject matter	1	2	3	4
J. Other (please list):	1	2	3	4

THANK YOU!

Please fax the completed survey,
or return it in the enclosed envelope by FEBRUARY 2 to:

Kenneth Tolo, Professor and Project Director
LBJ School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
P.O. Box Y, Austin, Texas 78713-8925
Fax (512) 471-1835

If you have any questions, please call Kenneth Tolo at 512-471-3270.

PROJECT CITIZEN TEACHER SURVEY

Complete this survey of you have used or plan to use Project Citizen in at least one class

The attached survey is divided into two parts. **Part One** requests information *for each class or group of students with whom you have used or will use* Project Citizen. **Part Two** asks your general impressions of Project Citizen and need not be answered on a per class basis.

Please return completed survey by: FEBRUARY 2, 1998

Please fax the completed survey, or return it in the enclosed, postage paid envelope to:
Dr. Kenneth Tolo, Professor and Project Director
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Drawer Y
Austin, TX 78713-8925
FAX: 512-471-1835

Teacher's Information

Name: ______________________ Position: ______________________

School name: ______________________ School district: ______________________

Address: ____

What is the best phone number at which to call you? ______________________

What is the best time for you to receive phone calls? ______________________

Fax: ______________________ E-Mail: ______________________

Number of classes, or groups of students, with whom you have used, or plan to use, the Project Citizen curriculum? ____________ *(For example, if you used Project Citizen with two 8th grade Social Studies classes in 1996-97, and one 7th grade English class in 1997-98, enter "3.")*

Your School's Information

Principal's Name: ____

Phone number of school, if different than above: ______________________

Percent ethnic/racial enrollment in school: ______________________

Percent of school's students receiving federal free or reduced school lunches (estimate): ____________

Is your school a public or private school? ______________________

Which grades are taught in your school? (Example: 6, 7, 8)______________________

In which US Congressional District is your school? ______________________

Part One: Classroom Information

Instructions:

(1) Please answer the following questions for **each class or group of students** with which you have used, or plan to use, Project Citizen.

(2) Use **one column** to answer questions for **each class or group of students** with which you have used, or plan to use, Project Citizen. If you have more than four classes or groups of students with which you have or will use Project Citizen, please copy this form. The number of columns you use should match the number of classes or groups of students you indicated on the previous page of this survey.

(3) If you do not know an answer, please indicate "DK". If the question is not applicable, please indicate NA".

	Class/Group #1	**Class/Group #2**	**Class/Group #3**	**Class/Group #4**	**Additional Comments**
1. Circle the year you used, or will use, Project Citizen for each class or group.	1995-1996 1996-1997 1997-1998	1995-1996 1996-1997 1997-1998	1995-1996 1996-1997 1997-1998	1995-1996 1996-1997 1997-1998	
2. Type of class or group (i.e. Social Studies, English)					
3. Total number of students in the class/group					
4. Total number of students in this class/group participating in Project Citizen					
5. Did you use Project Citizen as a curricular activity? (Please circle one)	curricular extra-curricular both	curricular extra-curricular both	curricular extra-curricular both	curricular extra-curricular both	
6. Grade level of the Project Citizen class/group (i.e. 6, 7, 8, etc.)					

293

Return completed survey to: Kenneth Tolo, LBJ School, P.O. Box Y, Austin, Tx 78713, Fax (512) 471-1835

294

	Class #1	Class #2	Class #3	Class #4	Additional Comments
7. Is your Project Citizen class... ? (please check appropriate category)	[ ] Gifted/Talented [ ] Regular [ ] Mixed Ability [ ] Remedial [ ] Special Education [ ] ESL	[ ] Gifted/Talented [ ] Regular [ ] Mixed Ability [ ] Remedial [ ] Special Education [ ] ESL	[ ] Gifted/Talented [ ] Regular [ ] Mixed Ability [ ] Remedial [ ] Special Education [ ] ESL	[ ] Gifted/Talented [ ] Regular [ ] Mixed Ability [ ] Remedial [ ] Special Education [ ] ESL	
8. Please estimate the percent ethnic/racial make up of the Project Citizen class.					
9. How many hours a week did your class spend on Project Citizen in the classroom?					
10. How many weeks did you spend on Project Citizen?					
11. Did you use "We the People...the Citizen and the Constitution" materials in this class? (Please circle one)	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No	
12. Did you use the "Foundations of Democracy" materials in this class? (Please circle one)	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No	

Return completed survey to: Kenneth Tolo, LBJ School, P.O. Box Y, Austin, Tx 78713, Fax (512) 471-1835

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Class #1	Class #2	Class #3	Class #4	Additional Comments
13. Which elements of the Project Citizen Teacher's Guide did you use? (Please check all appropriate boxes.)	☐ Students selected and identified a problem ☐ Students gathered information ☐ Students created portfolio ☐ Students participated in a simulated hearing ☐ Students participated in competition	☐ Students selected and identified a problem ☐ Students gathered information ☐ Students created portfolio ☐ Students participated in a simulated hearing ☐ Students participated in competition	☐ Students selected and identified a problem ☐ Students gathered information ☐ Students created portfolio ☐ Students participated in a simulated hearing ☐ Students participated in competition	☐ Students selected and identified a problem ☐ Students gathered information ☐ Students created portfolio ☐ Students participated in a simulated hearing ☐ Students participated in competition	
14. What activities were included in the competition? (Check those that apply) **Please indicate at which level (school, district, state) each activity was completed.**	☐ Simulated hearing Competition level(s): ☐ Submitting a portfolio Competition level(s): ☐ other (please explain) Competition level(s):	☐ Simulated hearing Competition level(s): ☐ Submitting a portfolio Competition level(s): ☐ other (please explain) Competition level(s):	☐ Simulated hearing Competition level(s): ☐ Submitting a portfolio Competition level(s): ☐ other (please explain) Competition level(s):	☐ Simulated hearing Competition level(s): ☐ Submitting a portfolio Competition level(s): ☐ other (please explain) Competition level(s):	
15. Please list the Project Citizen portfolio title. (If no portfolio was created, please list the policy topic the class studied.)					
16. Which factors led your class to select this topic?	☐ community concern ☐ news story ☐ parent interest ☐ teacher interest ☐ previous class topic ☐ other (please describe)________	☐ community concern ☐ news story ☐ parent interest ☐ teacher interest ☐ previous class topic ☐ other (please describe)________	☐ community concern ☐ news story ☐ parent interest ☐ teacher interest ☐ previous class topic ☐ other (please describe)________	☐ community concern ☐ news story ☐ parent interest ☐ teacher interest ☐ previous class topic ☐ other (please describe)________	

Part Two: General Impressions of Project Citizen

Answers for these questions should be based on your general impressions of Project Citizen and need not be answered on a per class basis. Feel free to indicate that you do not know an answer "DK" or that a question is not applicable to you "N/A." Please note that responses will be summarized collectively.

17.) How did you first hear about Project Citizen?

_____ Through Center for Civic Education
_____ Through Another Teacher
_____ Through Project Citizen State Coordinator
_____ Other (please explain): ________________

18.) Why did you decide to use Project Citizen in your classroom?

19.) To what extent are the following challenges to using in Project Citizen in your classroom?

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
A. Time required in class	1	2	3	4
B. Time required outside of class	1	2	3	4
C. Abilities of students	1	2	3	4
D. State curricular requirements	1	2	3	4
E. District curricular requirements	1	2	3	4
F. Lack of support from school administration	1	2	3	4
G. Already have a successful method for teaching civics (please explain):	1	2	3	4
H. Training was inadequate to get started	1	2	3	4
I. Uncomfortable with the subject matter	1	2	3	4
J. Other (please list):	1	2	3	4

20.) Have you received training on how to use Project Citizen in your classroom? _____Yes _____No
If so:

a) When did you receive training? ____________ (Month) ______ (Year)

b) Where was the training and who conducted it?

c) Did the training prepare you to use Project Citizen? _____ Yes _____No

d) How could the training have been improved?

21.) What did the training look like? (Check all that apply.)

_____ Informative session about the Center for Civic Education and an overview of Project Citizen.
_____ Review or "walk through" of Project Citizen classroom materials.
_____ "How to" session for teaching Project Citizen in the classroom.
_____ Forum for getting principal/school/community support.
_____ Other (please explain) ____

22.) Does Project Citizen help your students meet any education or curriculum requirements or standards in your state? _____Yes _____No

Please explain how Project Citizen does or does not help students meet state requirements or standards.

23.) When using Project Citizen, how many hours per week, on average, do you spend outside the classroom planning Project Citizen?

_____0 _____1-5 _____6-10 _____11-15 _____More than 15

24.) On average, how many hours per week do students spend outside of class working on Project Citizen?

_____0 _____1-5 _____6-10 _____11-15 _____More than 15

25.) In what ways have parents been involved in Project Citizen?

_____Helped create portfolio
_____Helped generate policy topic
_____Donated supplies
_____Helped raise funds
_____Other (please explain)____
_____Provided financial support
_____Donated time
_____Served as portfolio judge
_____Helped implement portfolio recommendations

26.)If you have used judges for a simulated hearing or a portfolio competition, please list the names and positions/affiliations of those individuals.

Name of Judge	Position/Affiliation	Year

27.)Do you think that Project Citizen is a good way to teach civic education? _____Yes _____No
Why or why not?

28.)Would you use Project Citizen again in your classes? _____Yes _____No
Why or why not?

29.)What are the primary strengths of Project Citizen?

30.)What are the primary weaknesses of Project Citizen?

31.)How would you improve Project Citizen?

32.) What types of support have you received from your principal in order to help you use Project Citizen in your classroom? Check all that apply.

_____Financial support
_____Materials
_____Recognition
_____None
_____Access to space
_____Release time
_____Other (please explain)_____________________

33.)What types of support have you received from the Project Citizen coordinator in your state?

_____Financial
_____Materials
_____Community contacts
_____Recognition
_____Other (please explain)____
_____Advice regarding teaching methods
_____Assistance in networking with other teachers
_____Training
_____None

34.) Do you raise money for Project Citizen?_____Yes _____ No

If so, how?

_____Legislative appropriations
_____Donations from businesses
_____City council or school board grants
_____Use own (teacher's) financial resources
_____Other (please explain)____
_____Community donations
_____Foundation grants
_____Student fundraisers

35.) For what purposes was this money needed?

_____Travel to competitions
_____Materials
_____Telephone/fax expenses
_____Reception
_____Training
_____Judge honoraria
_____Postage
_____Other (please explain)_____________________

36.)What were your impressions and expectations the first time you heard of Project Citizen?

37.) In what ways have your initial impressions and expectations been met or not met?

38.)Rate how much of a impact the following elements of Project Citizen had on student learning.

	No impact	A little impact	Some impact	Considerable impact
A. Selecting the problem	1	2	3	4
B. Researching the problem	1	2	3	4
C. Creating a portfolio	1	2	3	4
D. Competition	1	2	3	4
E. Presenting to an outside group	1	2	3	4
F. Working as a group	1	2	3	4
G. Other (please explain):	1	2	3	4

39.)Rate how well you think Project Citizen helped your students achieve the following goals.

	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Considerably
A. Develop a greater understanding of public policy	1	2	3	4
B. Learn more about community problems	1	2	3	4
C. Increase knowledge of resources to solve problems	1	2	3	4
D. Improve research skills	1	2	3	4
E. Improve cooperative problem-solving and teamwork skills	1	2	3	4
F. Improve communication skills	1	2	3	4
G. Learn how to apply solutions to problems	1	2	3	4
H. Gain awareness of their potential to have an impact on their community	1	2	3	4
I. Gain a better understanding of government processes	1	2	3	4
J. Gain an understanding of responsibilities of citizens	1	2	3	4
K. Gain awareness of community groups	1	2	3	4
L. Develop a more favorable attitude toward government	1	2	3	4
M. Develop an understanding of the use of a portfolio as a means of communication and persuasion	1	2	3	4
N. Other (please explain):	1	2	3	4

40.) In any of the classes in which you used Project Citizen, was there any subsequent action taken by the students, either as individuals or as a group, to pursue resolution of the public policy problem following the completion of the classroom portion of Project Citizen? (e.g. volunteer work, presentation of recommendation to policy makers)? If so, please describe the action taken and the results.

THANK YOU!

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, please call Kenneth Tolo at 512-471-3270

Return completed survey to: Kenneth Tolo, LBJ School, P.O. Box Y, Austin, Tx 78713, Fax (512) 471-1835

Appendix G. Project Citizen Student Survey: January 1998

Project Citizen Student Survey Cover Sheet

Teachers: Please complete this sheet and return it with your completed student surveys to the address below. Thank you.

Date____________________

Name: ____

Phone: ____

School Name: ____

State: ________

Number of Surveys Enclosed: ________

Return this sheet and the completed student surveys to:

Kenneth Tolo, Professor and Project Director
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
University of Texas at Austin
Drawer Y
Austin, TX 78713-8925
FAX: 512-471-1835

PROJECT CITIZEN SURVEY

This survey asks about your experiences participating in *We the People...Project Citizen.* Please answer every question completely. Your responses will help improve the program for other participants. Thank you for your assistance.

1. What did you learn about the policy problem your class studied?

2. What should be done to solve that problem?

3. Did Project Citizen help you learn: (Please circle)

a) what public policies are?	yes	no
b) how public policies are made?	yes	no
c) how you can help solve problems in your school or community?	yes	no
d) how to gather information on public policy problems?	yes	no
e) how to conduct interviews on the phone or in person?	yes	no
f) how to work in groups with other students?	yes	no

4. How did you collect information about your topic? (Please check all that apply)

_____ Conducted interviews in person

_____ Wrote letters requesting information

_____ Read newspapers and/or magazines

_____ Used computers/internet

_____ Conducted phone interviews

_____ Used library materials

_____ Watched television news

_____ Other, please list: _______________

5. Of the choices you checked in question 4, which, if any, did you use for the first time?

6. How much did you like participating in Project Citizen? (Please circle one)

Not at all	A little	Somewhat	A lot
1	2	3	4

7. What do you like about Project Citizen?

8. What do you dislike about Project Citizen?

9. List another important policy problem in your community or school. What steps could you take to help find a solution to this problem?

10. Do you think it is important for people to vote in elections? Why or why not?

11. List three characteristics of a good citizen.

Appendix H. Sample Project Citizen Letters

RUDEN
McCLOSKY
SMITH
SCHUSTER &
RUSSELL, P.A.

200 EAST BROWARD BOULEVARD
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301

POST OFFICE BOX 1900
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33302

(954) 764-6660
FAX (954) 764-4996

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER: (954) 527-2410
E-MAIL: [illegible]@RUDEN.COM

sample follow to
partner lawyer!

January 17, 1997

VIA FAX
Karla Stetter, Esq.
Assistant County Attorney
Pasco County, Florida
Pasco County Governmental Center
7530 Little Road, Suite 340
New Port Richie, Florida 34654

Re: Project Citizen

Dear Karla:

I really appreciate that you agreed to assist on Project Citizen.

As we discussed today, I chair the Law Related Education Committee of the Local Government Law Section of the Florida Bar. The committee is working with the Florida Law Related Education Association, Inc., a non-profit organization, to foster a program known as "Project Citizen" for students in selected middle schools throughout the state, including in your area.

The goal of Project Citizen is to educate students about the method and procedures used in our political process. Students identify a community issue and then gather and evaluate information on the issue from a variety of sources. They next develop a proposed public policy to address the issue, evaluate its consistency with constitutional principles and develop an action plan of how they might influence their elected officials to adopt the proposed policy. The students ultimately prepare a class portfolio relating to their efforts and present the same in a competition format in front of a panel of judges.

Your assistance is requested to work with the teacher and students as they pursue Project Citizen in the classroom this year at the following school:

Teacher: Aelia Marotta (813-836-4404)
Hudson Middle School (813-836-4439/f)
14540 Cobra Way
Hudson, Florida 34669

Center for Civic Education

Charles N. Quigley
Executive Director

Board of Directors

Thomas A. Craven, Esq.
President
Sacramento

Ruth M. Godebusch
Vice President
Fresno

Dr. William L. Lucas
Secretary
Los Angeles

A. Ronald Oakes
Chief Financial Officer
San Diego

Joseph Bergeron, Esq.
San Mateo

Wendy Borcherdt
Los Angeles

Dr. R. Freeman Butts
Carmel

John F. Cooke
Burbank

Jane A. Couch
Washington, D.C.

Dr. H. David Fish
San Diego

Prof. C. Hugh Friedman
San Diego

Maxine Frost
Riverside

Dr. Tom Giugni
Burlingame

Hon. Richard Ibanez
Los Angeles

Eileen Kurahashi, Esq.
Los Angeles

Dr. Joseph P. McElligott
Sacramento

Wesley Mitchell
Los Angeles

Ann Patricia O'Connor, CSJ
Santa Rosa

Marcella Osterhaus
Fresno

Dr. Richard F. Pedersen
Claremont

Jay J. Plotkin, Esq.
North Hollywood

Dr. Paul M. Possemato
Laguna Beach

Jonathan S. Shapiro, Esq.
Los Angeles

Robert B. Taylor
Los Angeles

Pauline Weaver
Oakland

Pearl West
Stockton-Sacramento

October 23, 1997

Dear Project Citizen Participant:

Thank you for your participation in the 1997-98 **We the People... Project Citizen** program. For some of you this will be your second year and we want to welcome you as well as the first time teachers. Once again, there will be a state competition with the winning portfolio representing California at the national finals. These finals will be held at the National Conference of State Legislatures Annual Meeting in Las Vegas, Nevada this summer.

As you know, the culminating activity of **Project Citizen** is the development and completion of the portfolio. We strongly encourage you to complete this activity. We will once again have the competition by region with winners in the ten regions being submitted to the state competition. Each student in each class that submits a portfolio will receive a certificate signed by your local legislator.

To assist us with our planning, we need to know if your class will be entering the competition. Please complete the enclosed form and return by December 8, 1997. You will receive the specific details concerning the competition at a later date.

Best wishes for a productive year. Please feel free to call Gayle Kernick at 916-967-3908 or Roy Erickson at 916-863-6614 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gayle Kernick Roy Erickson

Gayle Kernick and Roy Erickson

5146 Douglas Fir Road ■ Calabasas, CA 91302-1467 ■ (818) 591-9321
Fax (818) 591-9330 ■ e-mail: center4civ@aol.com

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We the People: Project Citizen

March 7, 1997

Dear Jim & Jeff

I would like to welcome you to the **We The People - Project Citizen** program in Ohio. This is the first year Ohio has participated in the pilot program through the Center for Civic Education. Your patience as we develop the program is appreciated!

By now, you should have received the classroom set of books with the teacher's guide. Each of you is on a different time-line for completion of your project due to proficiency tests and other activities in your school. However, we all have **a common time-line of the state competition the first week in June, 1997**. All projects will need to be forwarded to me at Apollo Career Center the end of May.

Please take a moment and **thoroughly read the teacher packet** before beginning the activity. Enclosed is a brochurefrom the Center on the project You can request additional copies FREE from the project directors Greg Brozite or Michael Fischer at the Center by calling 1-800-350-4223. The brochures would be good to share with parents, administration and your community. They would also be excellent for news media as you generate publicity for your school.

I am available to answer your questions. As a career/economic ed coordinator at Apollo Career Center, **my phone number is 419/998-2984.** Please don't hesitate to call. I would prefer to help you *early* in solving challenges you may encounter rather than too late!

Please return the enclosed form to me so that I will know that you are on-line to compete in June. The Ohio competition will be in the newly renovated Ohio Capitol. Sponsors for the Ohio competition will be National Council of State Legislators with President of the Ohio Senate Richard Finan and Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives JoAnn Davidson. I am meeting with Ohio legislators to begin planning the contest in 2 weeks. The winning Ohio project will be taken to Philadelphia for national competition as one of 20 state entries the week of August 6 - 9! Each student participating will receive a signed certificate.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

****** If you have not turned the forms contained with your classroom set of books back to the Center, please take a moment and do so today. These help us to keep in touch with you and to help the project plan ahead.

I look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

Libby

Libby Cupp
Coordinator, Project Citizen

CUMBERLAND SCHOOL OF LAW • 800 LAKESHORE DRIVE • BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA 35229-7015 • TELEPHONE (205) 870-2433 • (800) 888-7301

Alabama
Center for Law
and Civic
Education

August 18, 1997

Dear Members of the Legislature:

During the 1996-97 school year, the Alabama Center for Law and Civic Education participated in the national pilot of PROJECT CITIZEN, a middle school program for community problem identification and group problem solving. Much of the funding for the Alabama pilot of this program, sponsored and developed by the Center for Civic Education and the National Conference of State Legislatures, was provided by a line item appropriation from the Alabama State Legislature.

You as a member of the Alabama House or Senate should take considerable pride in what Alabama students accomplished during the Project Citizen pilot year. Earlier this month, it was announced that the winner of the Alabama Project Citizen portfolio competition, Mrs. Shelley Chumley's sixth grade class at Bryan Elementary School in Morris, Alabama, has been selected as the Second Place Winner in the National Competition held in August during the National Conference of State Legislatures in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Bryan Elementary's PROJECT CITIZEN exhibit is now on display at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, where it will remain on public view through September.

If you would like to see examples of other Alabama students' work from Project Citizen, please stop by to see the Alabama 2nd and 3rd place winners on display in the 6th floor hallway during the special session. We think you will be surprised and pleased with the quality of their work.

If you know of teachers in your district who might like to participate in this program during the 1997-98 school year, please ask them to contact our office and we will help in whatever way we can. Thank you for your support during the critical startup year of this program!

Sincerely,

Janice A. Cowin
Executive Director

L. Wade Black
PROJECT CITIZEN Coordinator

Freedoms Foundation
at Valley Forge

February 11, 1998

Mrs. Arlene Ackerman
Chief Academic Officer
District of Columbia Public Schools
415 12th Street, N.W.
Room 1209
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Mrs. Ackerman,

Project Citizen is a program which gives children grades 6-9 the opportunity to become more self-reliant and better understand the decision-making process.

I have met and discussed the program with Helena Jones, her assistant Saundra Handy, and Gladys Morgan and they have identified ten middle/Junior high schools that could participate in Project Citizen during the spring term. The list of those schools is attached.

Helena has the materials concerning the program which shows that it supports the community service credit effort; reinforces literacy; conforms to standards; the teacher and student guides are excellent and available without charge; and based on experience with teachers in the Philadelphia area last year, Project Citizen is exceptionally well received by everyone who participates in it.

With your approval we (myself, Helena, others she may designate and teachers from the Philadelphia area) can meet with appropriate teachers from the ten schools for a general orientation session (Project Citizen has a modest budget which will allow for the District to be reimbursed for substitute time and the cost of a lunch if necessary) and launch the program. Most teachers arrange for Project Citizen to last about six weeks with presentations done prior to the end of May.

I am enclosing a copy of both guides for your examination and am providing a copy of this letter to those listed above. They are able to provide you additional information as you may require.

I would only add that having students participate in this project will be done at no cost to the District Schools.

Sincerely yours,
Lon Weber
Lon W. Weber, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President for Education
Project Citizen Coordinator,
District of Columbia

Enclosures

cc: Helena Jones
Saundra Handy
Gladys Morgan

P.O. Box 706, Valley Forge, PA 19482-0706 • Telephone: 610.933.8825 • Fax: 610.935.0522 • E-mail: [illegible]

March X, 1998

Dear Colleague:

Attached are letters we intend to send to Senators Specter and Harkin of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education in support of funding for the *We the People...The Citizen and the Constitution* civic education program.

We the People... is a voluntary program available to public and private schools in every State. The program is a substantive learning process in which students are immersed in the basic texts of American democracy including the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, and *The Federalist*. Through this they gain a fundamental knowledge of the history and principles of our constitutional democracy.

Funding for the program also helps support *We the People... Project Citizen*, which is now in its second year of national implementation. The program is a middle school civic education project designed to help classes work together to identify a public policy issue in their community, research the issue, determine various ways to address it, recommend a class policy, and develop an action plan to have their policy adopted. Classes prepare portfolios (similar to science fair format) to present their work and testify about their project before judging panels comprised of community members.

We the People... has been demonstrated in academic studies to be an effective educational process which fosters attitudes of civic virtue among our nation's future leaders. Character traits such as civility, individual responsibility, self-discipline, a healthy skepticism about government and politics, compromise, toleration of diversity, and loyalty to the nation and its principles help to keep our political process effective. Developing these traits in future generations is an important step to ensure their readiness and willingness to participate when the time arrives.

We urge you to join us in signing this letter. Please call Mike Stinson (Senator Kempthorne) at 4-6142 if you have any questions or would like to sign the letter.

Sincerely,

Dirk Kempthorne

Xxxxxx

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JUN 13 1997

Arizona State Legislature
1700 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

October 21, 1996

Arizona State Senate
Arizona House of Representatives
Capitol Complex
1700 W. Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Dear Legislators and Staff:

We the People...Project Citizen is an excellent civic education program being offered to students in grades 6-9 that teaches them about the role of the state legislature. The National Conference for State Legislatures, the Arizona Bar Foundation, and the House and Senate have formed a partnership to promote this worthy educational program in our schools. A detailed brochure is attached.

An important component of Project Citizen is the meaningful involvement of legislators and staff. On Tuesday, December 3, approximately 100 students will be competing in the Project Citizen Competition which will be held in hearing rooms in the House and Senate. We are in need of a total of 20-22 legislators and staff representative of both houses to serve as competition judges. The Competition is being organized by the Arizona Bar Foundation. A Judges Orientation and Reception is planned for Thursday, November 21 from 4:00 - 6:00 p.m. at the Arizona Bar Center located at 111 W. Monroe, Suite 1800. If you would like to serve as a judge and can attend the training, please confirm your attendance by November 11th with Diana Durham at the Arizona Bar Foundation, 340-7364.

I hope that you will join us in helping make Project Citizen a successful learning experience for the students.

Very truly yours,

John Greene
JOHN GREENE
President of the Senate

MARK W. KILLIAN
Speaker of the House

cc: Lynda Rando, Arizona Bar Foundation

Enclosures

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
P.O. BOX 839966
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78283-3966

February 23, 1998

Mr. Norm Goldberg
C/O John Wood Middle School
14800 Judson Road
San Antonio, Texas 78233

Dear Mr. Goldberg:

Thank you for the opportunity to meet with the students who are participating in Project Citizen at John Wood Middle School. The video presentation regarding problems with students walking on Wenzel Road was very descriptive and easy to understand. It also clearly illustrated the need for sidewalks on Wenzel from the school driveway to Ridge Meadow.

After reviewing the video and personally observing this section of Wenzel on two occasions, I have added the sidewalk project to our schedule for the summer of 1998. The Streets and Drainage Division of the Public Works Department will be performing the work. To ensure safety for those using the sidewalk, it will be necessary to add fill on the north side of Wenzel (next to the school) and to extend the drainage pipes before building the sidewalk. Further, after the sidewalk is in place, they will add a pipe handrail along the sidewalk as it crosses the creek, and install a painted crosswalk across Wenzel at Ridge Meadow. The Traffic Division will also add warning signs in advance of the crosswalk, paint a centerline on Wenzel, and erect 20 MPH school speed limit signs for traffic on Wenzel to assist in making the pedestrian crossing as safe as possible.

In addition, in reviewing the situation around the school the following actions will be taken over the next 60 days:

- Install a street name sign at Wenzel and Fountainwood.
- Repair potholes on Wenzel at Fountainwood.
- Install a four-way stop at Woods Hole and Waddeson Bluff.
- Evaluate the signal timing at Judson and Fountainwood and adjust as appropriate to protect students crossing Judson from turning vehicles.
- Paint pedestrian crosswalks on Nacogdoches at Judson.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER"

- Add school speed limits signs on Judson east of Wenzel and west of Fountainwood to advise motorists of the presence of the Middle School.

Again, thank you and the Project Citizen students for bringing these needs to my attention. I will follow up to ensure that these improvements are completed in a timely manner. Please call me or Maria Valero, Customer Service Specialist, at 207-8023 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

John L. German, PE
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

JLG/jlg

xc: Rocky Aranda
Andy Ballard, P.E.
Gabriel Perez
Maria Valero

BEST COPY AVAILABLE